MÜNSTERBERG *and* MILITARISM CHECKED

CHARLES W. SQUIRES

NUNC COGNOSCO EX PARTE

THOMAS J. BATA LIBRARY
TRENT UNIVERSITY

CHARLES W. SQUIRES

MÜNSTERBERG AND MILITARISM CHECKED

BY

CHARLES W. SQUIRES, M.A., D.D.

TORONTO
WILLIAM BRIGGS
1915

Copyright, Canada, 1915,
by Charles W. Squires.

THIS BOOK

IS GRATEFULLY DEDICATED TO THE MEMORY OF
THE GREAT LIBERATOR

PROFESSOR WILLIAM JAMES
OF HARVARD UNIVERSITY

AT WHOSE FEET THE WRITER WAS PRIVILEGED
TO SIT FOR THREE YEARS WHILE A
STUDENT AT THE FAMOUS
CAMBRIDGE INSTITUTION

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2019 with funding from
Kahle/Austin Foundation

https://archive.org/details/munsterbergmilit0000squi

PREFACE

At the beginning no man is conscious of the difficulty that actually belongs to the attempt to record matters of fact with an unbiased mind. The personal equation is certain to be more or less insistent. It is next to impossible that it should be otherwise. However, an honest attempt has been made to be fair to the description of the facts pertaining to the most terrible war in all history.

Münsterberg's book, "The Peace and America," which is indeed a splendid example of twilight vision, seemed to call for an answer that would bring into the daylight certain facts covered over and shaded by him as if they were always intended for the night.

As the author of the above-mentioned book appears to be misinformed, or prejudiced, or both, concerning the causes of the war, I have treated this problem very fully in the book, giving two chapters to it. Kultur, so elaborately defined by the Professor, has received

much attention. The loyal activities of Canada and of the other Colonies have been dealt with at length. The steps taken by France and Italy have been clearly shown to be justified, while the attitude of the United States and her super-neutrality have been placed before the reader in their true light.

The conclusion is a clarion call to England and her Allies to awake from their half-hearted indifference and to put forth every effort to save the world from the Germanic menace.

C. W. S.

CONTENTS

		PAGE
CHAPTER I.		
The Causes of the War	. . . . .	9
CHAPTER II.		
The Conflict of Principles	. . . .	45
CHAPTER III.		
German Kultur	. . . . .	65
CHAPTER IV.		
Canada, Newfoundland and Ireland	. .	110
CHAPTER V.		
France Justified	. . . . .	147
CHAPTER VI.		
Italy Justified	. . . . .	160
CHAPTER VII.		
American Neutrality and Peace	. . .	175
CHAPTER VIII.		
To-morrow	. . . . .	211

Münsterberg and Militarism Checked

CHAPTER I.

THE CAUSES OF THE WAR.

The writer of "The Peace and America" does not seek to convince by argument or to persuade. He wishes to stand out as a witness to the truth as he sees it. But the last four words in the preceding sentence make all the difference in the world. We have the truth through coloured glasses, for we have it as he sees it. According to his own principles, truth should be depersonalized, and the more a German depersonalizes truth the better for the truth. If the personal equation does not create the truth it certainly distorts it. This has been acknowledged throughout the book, and the latter is a splendid example of it. The rough edges of the German hatred have been skilfully rubbed off, the crimes of the Government have been all veneered over with a special kind of stuff made for the purpose in

Germany, the greatness of the German people has been loudly preached, the ideals of the "national soul" of the people have been made bare, and all for the purpose of throwing dust in the eyes of the American people, so that they may remain "neutral" according to the German idea of neutrality.

Certainly we do not refuse the author sincerity, but sincerity is not usually the result of logic and has nothing to do with the rightness of a cause. The destroyers of Jesus were sincere. Most of the vehement persecutors of the past were sincere, but their sincerity did not make them right in their persecutions. When Bishop Weston of Zanzibar attempted to excommunicate the Bishop of Hereford his action was sincere enough as far as that went, and it was logical, too, according to his assumed premises, but it was not according to the highest moral principles. Münsterberg may sincerely believe that England started this war, but this sincere belief cannot alter the facts as they really are.

It has been asked over and over again with great earnestness, how does it happen that the peace-loving English and French people are now engaged in a disastrous war? And how does it happen that the British and French people are practically unanimous in their assent to it? It is clear that the British,

at least, did not contemplate it, for they had no land army but a "contemptible" one. Yet within the space of four or five days the community will of the British people declared that Britain was bound to go into the struggle. This inner voice expressed itself imperatively through the Government at midnight on August 4th, 1914.

Almost to the last moment there was a widespread feeling in favor of neutrality. All classes and conditions of men declared in almost every conceivable way that Great Britain was not bound morally or in any other way to enter the struggle. Mass meetings were held to protest against war, and one, at least, had an attendance of 14,000.

The Labour party in the House of Commons was insistent in urging England to maintain neutrality, and Mr. Ramsay McDonald, Chairman of the Labour party, presented the matter very strongly for the constituency. But two days after Sir Edward Grey's speech on the eve of the war, Mr. McDonald resigned because his own party refused to allow him to read a resolution before the House of Commons containing a bare suggestion that England had taken a wrong course. The whole Cabinet was largely in favour of neutrality, and on the very eve of the declaration of war not less than six ministers passed over their resigna-

tions to the Prime Minister. But what a change the activities of Germany brought about! Within a few hours an extraordinary unanimity took possession of the country, and all classes and conditions decided that England could not retain her honour and remain out of the war.

Certainly, it is well to acknowledge that Lord Morley and Mr. John Burns resigned their seats in the Cabinet and that Mr. Charles Trevelyn retired from the Ministry, but it is more than likely that it was their resentment against the concealment by the Cabinet of certain crucial facts that led to their retirement. Then there were certain people in England, as in every other country, who believed that war was wrong under any circumstances. Germany had a goodly number of such people and England had her share. Believing that the very principles upon which war was based were entirely immoral, they took every opportunity of protesting against it. They did not consider that Jesus himself, who advocated peace everywhere, did not counsel peace at any price. On one occasion, with a whip of small cords, He drove the money-changers out of the temple. He had exhausted a veritable treasure-house of love upon these people and when that was of no avail simply drove them out with a whip.

The Labour party felt within its heart that Britain should constitute herself an armed dictator and remain neutral. But soon it was discovered that this neutrality would be equal to the case of an armed man, who had solemnly promised to help a poor boy threatened by a bully, standing alongside with the written promise of help in his pocket, and seeing the small boy not only thrashed, but almost strangled to death by the bully, who was a dozen times stronger than the one attacked. As soon as the Labour party saw the dishonour involved in this position it dropped it as if it had been a burning coal.

The cause of the sudden change in the minds of the British people was due to the fact that they discovered that the foundations of civilization were being broken up by a mad nation without any sense of international honour. Everyone agreed that war was tremendous folly, but no other honourable way was open for a free and God-fearing people. Britain was compelled to fling herself in the path of a well-armed and tyrannical nation. German idealism might have been little known to the British people and the abysmal underlying ferment that caused the eruption little understood. But when a storm that threatened to deluge all Europe in blood broke forth her duty was made as clear as the noonday

sun. She must protect the weak and uphold righteousness. This was her task and she has been endeavoring to perform it to the best of her ability ever since the moment when it became clear to her. This work seems to her to be so righteous that no one even suggests that the war should stop.

Joseph H. Choate, in his introduction to Mr. J. A. Cramb's book, "Germany and England," lays bare the deep underlying cause of the present war. He says: "The real cause, as shown by Professor Cramb, is the intense hatred of Germany for England, and her lofty ambition to establish a world empire upon the ruins of the British Empire." She was not content to remain within her own boundaries and look across the sea at an insular power whose drumbeat was heard around the world, but year after year the underlying hatred burned fiercer and fiercer, fed by the military ideas of the Hohenzollerns, who constantly fanned the flame by two contrasted thoughts—England's power and Empire and Germany's unmerited impotency, due to her position. Hate is acknowledged to be one of the most destructive and infernal egoistic emotions of human nature. It is a relic of the dim past when man was on a low plane of morality and scarcely a moral being at all. It is an expression of deep unhappiness regarded as

due to another who is essentially on an equality with the one who has the emotion.

England was regarded as the one equal to herself in many ways, who brought about Germany's unhappiness, and England's land army, regarded as inferior (as it actually was) to Germany's trained legions, was looked upon with contempt, while the feeling towards the navy was something akin to terror. These emotions would have gradually died out but for Prussian leadership under the power of the Hohenzollerns, which had pledged itself to military and naval power, and constantly kept the thought of world-empire before the people. Thus steadily and surely the preparations for war on a tremendous scale went on year after year. Vast quantities of ammunition were turned out and stored. Immense siege guns were constructed at the Krupp works at Essen. The whole of Germany for forty years was an immense drilling camp for soldiers. Getting the impulse from the primal hatred of Britain, the whole machinery went forward until finally the majority of Germans scarcely knew why they were making such immense preparations. They only knew that they were preparing, desperately preparing, and the external preparation initiated by the military caste reacted finally upon the inner life, and prepared Germany felt compelled to fight some-

thing and to strike somewhere. The Generals had only to point to England and the game was on. Germany found herself in the midst of the most brutal struggle on record.

The spirit of the German in this fight is entirely different from the spirit of the Austrian. This is very evident in the production and reception by the German people of the "Hymn of Hate." It is asserted, upon good authority, that the composer of this hymn, Ernst Lissauer, received the Iron Cross from the Emperor as a reward of service to his country. Imagine the King of England bestowing the Victoria Cross for a song of hate directed against Germany. Impossible to conceive it. Englishmen are not made to foster hatred, but to put it down, to overcome it. The terrible picture of the Kaiser, then, with a "formidable moustache" is no "absurd caricature" put in false contrast to the "mild expression of the face of George V., and the gentle melancholy features of Czar Nicholas, and the comfortable philistine expression of President Poincaré, and the youthful look of Albert of Belgium." However William II. looks with "those wonderful eyes" so earnestly referred to by Professor Münsterberg, the "hearty laugh" and "the incomparable charm of his mood as host" and interest in "good quotations from Mark Twain," we won-

der why he took such delight in the "Hymn of Hate" composed by Ernst Lissauer. Can a man of high principle welcome and find enjoyment in a "Hymn of Hate"? It is very well for one to laugh heartily at "some quotations from Mark Twain" in the presence of a man after his own heart, but the true test of a man's greatness is his attitude towards his enemy and towards weak nations, especially when he is pledged to preserve the integrity of the latter.

A leading Vienna newspaper, the *Fremdenblatt,* has published a poem in reply to the "Hymn of Hate" that has attracted world-wide attention. The *Fremdenblatt* poem runs:

"Sing not the song of hate.
It is a hateful song,
And foreign to the Austrian nature.
We are fighting, not for hate,
But against hate. . . . . .
We would prefer to fight
With a pure conscience and pure heart.
Hence must we uphold, within ourselves,
That love of our fellow men which our noble troops have shown
When they have handed over
Bread to the starving enemy in the trenches.

. . . . . .

Poison not the souls of the children with hate,
Nor with the thoughts of vengeance.

. . . . . .

Who soweth hate shall reap hate,
We are fighting for the peace of the world,
And may the Lord God in His grace soon grant it unto us."

. . . . . .

Here we have a little touch of the Austrian spirit which is not by any means so deep-dyed as that of the German.

The terrible mistakes of the German people in respect to England, now coming clearly to the German consciousness, are by no means calculated to diminish her hatred. The triumphant hatred of the first weeks of the war has given place to a baffled hatred, and the latter is made only too evident by the use of asphyxiating gases in great abundance at Ypres and in a smaller measure at other places, the sinking of the *Lusitania* and the shooting down in great numbers of innocent civilians in Belgium, all entirely opposed to international agreements and in harmony with the lowest barbarism in warfare.

Germany had thought that England was a decaying nation and that was the πρῶτον ψεῦδος that stood out in the writing of Treitschke and Bernhardi, but it was an effectual falsehood, for when you add malignant lies to hate you have a combination that is calculated to work untold injury to the race when the opportunity comes for expression. Hate per-

petrates a terrible χωρισμός between individuals and when it becomes a χωρισμός between nations fortified by lies systematically circulated in the market-place, in the lecture halls at Berlin, Jena, Heidelberg and Bonn, and even in the pulpits, the gap becomes a veritable chasm.

England is a great robber-nation. Her "supremacy is an unreality, her political power is as hollow as her moral virtues; the one an arrogance and pretence, the other hypocrisy. She cannot long maintain that baseless supremacy. On the sea she is rapidly being approached by other Powers; her resources, except by immigration, are almost stationary, and her very immigration debases still further her resources. Her decline is certain. There may be no war. The display of power may be enough, and England after 1900, like Venice after 1500, will gradually atrophy, sunk in torpor. And who is to succeed her? Germany.

"And having visualized this future, the German imagination, in a tempest of envy or vehement hate, becomes articulate and takes various shapes, resulting in an almost complete arraignment of the British Empire, of the English character, and of all our institu-

tions, and all our efforts as an empire-building race."*

England is accused of weakness, regarded as a "timorous, craven nation, trusting to its fleet," with nothing but a mercenary army. Failing in Egypt and failing in India, she has no longer any right to hold up her craven head. But Germany, because of her scholarship, her mastery of science and philosophy, and her vast military power, is well fitted to rule those countries and show them the way to true happiness and advancement. She would recognize the power of their religion and the worth of their ancient literature. She would instil into them the virile blood of a brave and warlike nation and give them the power to rule themselves, and if they held any hand across the sea it would not be the limp hand of a "nation of shop-keepers" but the steady iron hand, hardened by successful and honourable conquest. So soliloquized the great and the mighty ones of Germany.

This war has proclaimed to all the world the untruth of the statement that the British Empire is ready to drop to pieces. The British Empire stands as a unit to-day in opposition to German militarism. To an outsider it may appear as loosely hung together. Certainly

*See "Germany and England," page 26. Cramb.

the distances between its constituent parts are wide but they are held together by the strongest spiritual cement that can bind any people. The spiritual qualities of liberty and goodwill bind the hearts of the Indian, the Egyptian, and the dweller on the British Isles. Englishmen at home had no idea before the war that the bonds were so strong. The Empire is a solid unit in this struggle. Without any conscription the colonies have sent in vast numbers of men and without any official demand they have gone. England's policy of freedom of speech, freedom of government and freedom in religious matters, although it might seem to be a shattering policy, yet has proved to be just the opposite. The conception, *freedom,* is a relation that binds the souls of men firmer than hooks of steel. This conception has permeated every nook and corner of the British Empire and is the special cement that binds together all its parts. And it is not merely a conception. *Θεωρία* has not been separated from *πρᾶξις.* It has been made to go on all fours. Freedom was an actuality in the Empire and yet it was not a freedom divorced from law, but a freedom that voluntarily submitted itself to law. Not a freedom threatened on every side by the "mailed fist," but a freedom conscious of the right of restrictions within bounds, a freedom that has shown gra-

titude for its own existence by placing its all upon the altar in time of need. Britain needs no other proof of the righteousness of her rule, needs no other criterion of the effectiveness of her policy. All her sons are ready and willing to fight for her, and the thought of each one in reference to himself and comrades is, "We will drain our dearest veins, but they shall be free."

Would a broken-down nation be able to boast of such heroic women as live on the British Isles and in Canada? We hear the following: According to a report of the British Board of Trade the total number of women registered for special war service to April 16th was approximately 47,000, of whom 8,089 had entered their names as willing to undertake armament work, and the 14,000 additional women required in the principal factories during the next few months are already in sight. Again, a number of nurses from the Royal Victoria Hospital at Montreal, on their way to the front to nurse wounded Canadian soldiers, were about to take passage on the *Transylvania* when they heard of the horrible loss of the *Lusitania*. They did not hesitate, but thought they should get consent from their parents. So they called up the latter by long-distance telephone and told them of the disaster, asking if they should set sail. The

Spartan mothers told them that their duty was to go and God would protect them. They then proceeded on their journey to make their sacrifice for the cause of right.

German hatred has manifested itself during this war time and time again by deeds of fearful atrocity. The words of the First Lord of the Admiralty in reference to the seven hundred victims of the cowardly raid on civilians at Scarborough and Hartlepool are very significant: "Viewed in its larger aspect, the incident is one of the most instructive and encouraging that has happened in the war. Nothing proves more plainly the effectiveness of British naval pressure than the frenzy of hatred aroused against us in the breasts of the enemy. This hatred has already passed the frontiers of reason. Practically the whole fast cruiser force of the German navy, including some great ships vital to their fleet and utterly irreplaceable, have been risked for the passing pleasure of killing as many English people as possible, irrespective of sex, age or condition, in the limited time available. Whatever feats of arms the German navy may hereafter perform, the stigma of the baby-killers of Scarborough will brand its officers and men while sailors sail the sea."

The President of the National Bank of Germany, in conversation with the correspondent

of the *New York Sun,* intimated that the feeling that Germany cherished towards France was one of pity and regret. Certainly France had to be "crushed"* so that she would never be able to come in Germany's "path" again. But she was so innocent and helpless that it was a pity to disturb her and give her flesh to the birds of heaven. Even Bismarck pitied the Parisians and was not willing to sharpen the sword for them. A milder treatment, he thought, would be better. This is gathered from his musings of January, 1871, upon the siege of Paris: "If the Parisians first received a supply of provisions and were then again put on half rations, and once more obliged to starve, that ought, I think, to work. It is like flogging. When it is administered continuously it is not felt so much. But when it is suspended for a time and then another dose inflicted, it hurts. I know that from the criminal court where I was employed. Flogging was still in use there." This was all very well for the French people, but for England no treatment would be too bad. To satisfy the "fanatical hatred and contempt" that Germany had for England something more bitter and terrible was in store. This terrible hatred has grown from year to year until it

*Deutschland und der nächste Krieg. Von Bernhardi.

has become a veritable mania. The editor of the *Staatszeitung* refers to it as "the gigantic, everlasting, inextinguishable hatred of Germans for England." Thus an Englishman is often referred to by Germans as a "Schwein," that is, a pig, and thousands of them are led to think that Britains will soon be eating horsemeat and vermin before they finally starve, caged up in their island-home by the Kaiser's mighty submarines. Sir Edward Grey is referred to as the prince of liars, and the rest of the ministers are dubbed "fellow-swine." A special correspondent of the *London Daily Mail,* while in conversation with a typical German, heard him remark:

"A panic-stricken tribe, these British, crawling about in London at night in their darkened streets like rats. But rich? Well, I should say so. A friend of mine on the General Staff tells me that London will yield us two thousand million English pounds, Manchester one thousand million, Glasgow another thousand million."

The same deep hatred lurks in the heart of the author of "The War and America," and "The Peace and America," notwithstanding the refrain that childishly comes in every now and then in the latter book, calculated to cover up the viper that is within his bosom: "I am grown peaceful as old age to-night." If he

has "grown peaceful", we judge from his books it is only because he is a little too old to shoulder a musket and would like, while striking at the fundamental principles lying at the heart of American national life, to draw a few more American dollars. This man has the audacity to hold his place in a great university founded upon principles that he seems to repudiate and from this vantage-ground of influence to hurl insults at the American people. He pokes fun at the men "not low in American councils" who are so terribly ignorant, that one man, at least, among them, asked him earnestly "whether Bavaria was a part of Prussia or not." He pities the "poor newspaper readers" whose minds are twisted with prejudice and does not seem to realize that however much the English and American minds have been biased in grasping and giving account of the truth, the ordinary German mind in Germany has scarcely been allowed a glimpse of it at all. He sneers at the "splendid assortment of knowledge" that the Americans give their boys, and hints that they lack German "discipline of mind" and German profundity. He doesn't like to say plainly that they are also sadly deficient in military idealism, although he anxiously notices this defect. A Boston telegraph operator "inquired whether Berlin was in France," and a member

of the Cabinet "was not aware that there is a difference between Budapest and Bucharest and was ready to wager that St. Petersburg lies on the Arctic Sea." Ex-President Eliot in a forcible speech in New York tells of the love of truth that marks the Teutonic peoples and the fine spirit of devotion that belongs to their character, but after the war begins he flatly contradicts himself. Thus the "brave leader of the anti-neutral party" blows hot and cold but at different times and under different circumstances. But the arrogant German finds that ex-President Eliot is astray in his account of historical facts. His statements in respect to scientific inventions show wonderful ignorance of historical events. He must sift his store of knowledge at the German will. So says Münsterberg, thus bearing witness to Ruskin's characterization of the German nature as follows:—

"Blessing is only for the meek and merciful; and a German cannot be either; he does not understand even the meaning of the words. A Frenchman is selfish only when he is vile and lustful; but a German, selfish in the purest state of virtue and morality. A Frenchman is arrogant only in ignorance; but no quantity of learning ever makes a German modest. Luther serenely damns the entire gospel of St. James because St. James happens

to be not precisely of his own opinions. Accordingly when the Germans get command of Lombardy, they bombard Venice, steal her pictures (which they can't understand a single touch of) and entirely ruin the country, morally and physically, leaving behind them misery, vice and intense hatred of themselves, wherever their accursed feet have trodden. They do precisely the same thing by France —crush her, rob her, leave her in misery of rage and shame; and return home smacking their lips and singing Te Deums."*

Perhaps the fundamental reason for the entrance of Britain into the great war now upon us is that Germany has voluntarily broken up the solidarity of Europe. With great complacency she looked on as Austria and Serbia were lighting the torch of world conflagration. One or two citizens of Serbia had committed a crime against Austria. Austria then made impossible demands upon Serbia embodied in a note of July 23rd, 1914, and Germany continued to look on regardless of the fact that she, with a few other great nations, was responsible for the peace and civilization of the West. Instead of being true to the responsibility resting upon her, she thought merely of selfish issues and her every

*See *Fors Clavigera,* published monthly for workingmen, Vol. IV, p. 84. Ruskin.

activity in reference to the matter was impregnated with selfishness. Italy has lately officially declared that Austria broke up the peace of Europe in a way that vitally affected her interest without in any way consulting her. The equilibrium of the Balkans was disturbed at one swoop without any regard whatever for Italy. Sir Edward Grey was the only man that spoke with a view to the larger issue, the peace of the world. Thus he worked for peace up until the last. Even Mr. Ramsay McDonald of the Labour Party acknowledged this. As late as August 2nd, Grey refused to support the Entente in this all-important matter. Germany declared war on Russia August 1st, 1914, and on France August 3rd. But it was not until eleven o'clock on the night of August 4th, twenty-four hours after Germany's war-note to France, that England declared war on Germany. She waited until the last. Her blow was to be a defensive one, and thus she delayed until no other way was open. She entered the war under protest and not without forceful appeals to the Great Powers to consider seriously the way events were drifting, and to beg them to put forth the hand to stay the course of events. But Europe was on the downgrade and it was hard for one nation to get its foot on the brake. As the monk, standing between the gladiators

in the ancient amphitheatre, strove with all his might to stop the first movement towards the shedding of blood, so Sir Edward Grey stood between the gladiators of Europe. But it was all in vain. The fire of hate was too strong. Only blood could quench it.

In the face of all this, the author of "The Peace and America" refers to the "ghastly war which three mighty neighbours have forced on the peace-loving German nation," and he hopes that some good will come to the German nation because of it. If self-denial can cure or help cure hatred, certainly the German people will be better after the war than before, for they have sacrificed enough for their hatred. He suggests also the novel idea that "Germany needs no new territory. No German wants a square foot of France or Russia, but it does need to enlarge its territory of idealism." At least one German is reported by the special correspondent of the *London Daily Mail* to have said: "We now own and mean to keep a large part of France, all Belgium, as much of Russia as we want, and have five hundred English officer prisoners, twenty thousand English soldiers, and close on a million other prisoners altogether."

Again, according to the author that we have in mind: "The spirit of England's pitiless aggression comes from many a quarter to

everyone who moves in the world." The grinding, pitiless yoke is talked of everywhere by hundreds and thousands of weary souls. A Hindu tells about England's egotism and refers to the "cruel destruction" of the freedom of the Indian nation. The "genial letter carrier" expresses "deep hatred against England" for cruelty in respect to the Irish people and a Chinese student rails against England's Opium War carried on for the ruin of China and the enrichment of England. How is it, we ask, that this man hears nothing but the cries of suffering humanity directed against England for her arrogance, her aggression and her oppression? Has not hetero-suggestion something to do with it? By his own expressed ideas he has been able to influence the weaker brethren who, partly to please one who lives on bombast and partly to have something to say, have set forth the ideas attributed to them, at least we suppose they did. Since the great German statesmen have lived on lies for the last twelve months and have been very lavish in the distribution of this food, we find it hard to retain our confidence in any assertions inspired by Germany.

Professor Ernst Haeckel did not seem to think that England's rule was marked by "pitiless aggression," for in his book on "A Visit to Ceylon," he remarks:—

"Since at the present day the successes of the English in Egypt are looked upon with disfavor in many quarters, I cannot here conceal my disagreement with this view. On the contrary, it appears to me that they should be hailed with satisfaction, alike on the ground of common humanity and on those of rational political action. The English are undoubtedly gifted beyond any other nation with the genius for founding and governing colonies. Instead, then, of watching the extension and consolidation of English power with grudging and envious eyes, we Germans should do better to study the political skill which brings progress and benefit to the whole human race."

Here we have a witness from the side of the enemy to the fact that England has a special gift beyond any other nation for governing foreign peoples. It was because of her genius here that she was permitted by Providence to do this work, and the Germans are jealous, as Haeckel says, of the English success in governing and too proud to try to discover the secret of how it is done.

But alas for what Eucken calls "the fluctuation of human opinion and sentiment with its fickleness and proneness to reaction."* Professor Haeckel has deliberately gone back upon what he said a few months ago. He has

*"Can We Still be Christians?" page 213. Eucken.

done the very thing that Professor Münsterberg accused Ex-President Eliot, the "brave leader of the anti-neutral party," of doing. That is, he has changed his tune. In the pages of the *Monistische Jahrhundert* he remarks very coldly: "In my personal opinion the most desirable fruits of victory, both for the future of Germany and a federated Europe are:—

"(1) The crushing of English tyranny.

"(2) The invasion of Great Britain and the occupation of London.

"(3) The division of Belgium. The largest portion, from Ostend to Antwerp in the west, to be a confederated German state, the northern part to be given to Holland, the southeastern part to be given to Luxemburg which, thus enlarged, becomes also a confederated German state.

"(4) A large number of the British colonies and the Congo Free State to go to Germany.

"(5) France to surrender to Germany some of her northeastern frontier provinces.

"(6) Russia to be rendered impotent by the reconstruction, under Austrian auspices, of the Kingdom of Poland.

"(7) The German provinces of the Baltic to be returned to the German Empire.

"(8) Finland, united with Sweden, to become an independent kingdom."

Why should this programme be conceived if England is gifted beyond other nations with a genius for governing? If her political skill touches beneficially the whole human race, as Haeckel asserts, why should she be invaded and her power crushed? German pride and ambition for empire furnish the answer and as Britain is the chief obstacle across her path, hatred of her is beyond definition or comparison. Rising from the abysmal depths of the German soul, it struggles to strike down, without thought, whatever is in its way. Thus a war for empire is ruthlessly waged and the world is baptized in blood.

As to the prime mover in this war we can do no better than cite the expression of the *German Humanity League* given some time ago from Rotterdam and intended for Socialists throughout the world. Here are the exact words:—

"We are face to face with the enemies of mankind. The German nation, driven into a wicked war by the Kaiser and his military entourage, cajoled by perjured statesmen in the Reichstag, and by false records circulated in every state in order to deceive our compatriots, has recklessly hurled itself against forces which, sustained by indisputable moral considerations, show no signs of weakening in their determination to expel from Belgium the

troops which covered her habitations with blood, and irreparably injured an innocent nation which our rulers had sworn to protect.

"We must earnestly appeal to every comrade who cares for the maintenance of international obligations to strive his utmost to crush and sweep away forever the domination of Prussian militarism within Germany, which, by its conspiracy against humanity, has disgraced and humiliated our nation in the eyes of the civilized world."

In the face of all this, there steps forth from the ranks of the Philistines an intellectual champion standing head and shoulders above the rank and file, namely, Rudolf Eucken. He comes to do battle for his country with a shower of poisoned arrows of thought. He had shot many arrows before but there was no necessity then of tipping them with poison. German pride and arrogance had not been seriously checked. Therefore his arrows were not intended to hurt but to stimulate to mental activity. The times have changed. Germany has become un-Christian and there is great necessity for an apology for taking this step. Germany has, according to the declaration of the *German Humanity League,* covered the inhabitants of Belgium with blood and entered a conspiracy against humanity. His country is at the bar

for condemnation and he speaks this time to his better self. "Can we still be Christian?" he asks. The question had for its subject primarily the whole of Christendom, but now the subject is changed and narrowed down to the German nation. "Can we (Germans) still be Christians? Are we following Christian ideals? Is it according to Christ to massacre 150 babies at one time and without warning? Was it Christian to cover Belgium with blood and tear it asunder by barbarous soldiers? Have we Germans used the only 'antidote to the soullessness of modern culture,' namely, 'the quickening forces of religion?'

"We have found that in Christianity 'unfathomable forces are slumbering, forces which have by no means lived themselves out and are still capable of breaking forth again and driving human life into new channels with an irresistible and elemental violence. The contact of divine and human begets daimonic forces which may work either for revolution and renewal, or for destruction and desolation.' To gain control of these and lead them into the right path was the especial task of the German people. But we were recreant to our duty and now the world rightly accuses us of being un-Christian. We have not as Goethe drawn inspiration from—

Der reinen reichen Quelle,
Die nun dorther sich ergiesset
Ueberfluessig ewig helle
Rings durch alle Welten fliesset."

Instead of this cry from the penitent one we have Professor Eucken in his hard-heartedness making a declaration in the *Algemeen Handelsblad* to the effect that "Germany did not wish this war; she is battling for civilization against barbarism," and that "England declared war against us because she hoped to reap an advantage herself from it."

It is very easy to show that these statements are entirely incorrect, for if Germany did not wish the war why did she so thoroughly prepare for it, and why did she turn all the results of mechanical science into one channel, namely, the military? Germany's tremendous and sudden rush on Paris demonstrated to the world that she had the purpose to make war for many years and this purpose had persistently manifested itself in outward activity. The design to crush France did not spring up in a moment. Did not Treitschke and Bernhardi, before the war, express the earnest opinion that France must be crushed? This was the thought of the German people. So well were they prepared that when the opportune moment came they hurled a tremendous mass of troops towards the French capital. The number of German army corps in time of

peace was twenty-five. But she had the material from which corps could be constituted in a short time. When war began the General Staff put into the field sixty-one army corps. In January, 1915, the number of fighting formations put into line by the German army was sixty-nine.

If Germany did not wish this war why did she so thoroughly and systematically prepare? If she possessed a modicum of imagination she would never make the claims referred to here. If Germans are on the defensive, why in the name of all creation are they still fighting on Belgian soil? The fact that all nations outside of Germany are convinced that she is the aggressor ought to sink deep into the German soul. National opinion weighed in the balances ought to mean something. Can Germany logically continue a "defensive warfare" when German soil has not been invaded? Or can it be that intense hatred has overtopped logic and turned the balances in favor of an aggressive warfare? This, on the face of it, seems to be the case.

Münsterberg asserts that this is "after all England's war against Germany, in which both Russia's desire for expansion and France's longing for vengeance were harnessed for the purposes of the British Empire. And they were harnessed with masterly skill which

might have furnished many a lesson to German diplomacy; crowned and uncrowned masters were at work." Here we have not only an example of the work of suggestion but of perverted suggestion. We have the example of a mind with opportunity to learn the truth but which will not learn it. Here is an illustration of a mind warped by ideas made in Germany. The author of "The Peace and America" must know deep in his heart that no nation could spring so many devilish devices for the destruction of human beings as the German nation, without long and careful research with one aim in view, namely, the breaking down of all opposition to Teutonic world-power. Witness the vast quantities of asphyxiating gases let loose in Belgium and Galicia, the methods of torture and the perfection of Zeppelins as war machines. Every detail of the German Army was perfected to the last degree and Münsterberg's contention appears to be true that "there are only three firmly organized establishments in the world, the Roman Church, the American Standard Oil Company and the German army." The Roman Church has perfected her organization gradually through many years of struggle not merely for protective purposes, but also for the purpose of making inroads upon the fortress of evil. In

the same way Germany has perfected her military organizations, but chiefly in order that she might at the opportune moment expand her borders at whatever cost. The time came, the bell struck and Germany launched her barbarian hordes upon the world.

Correspondence between President Poincaré of France and King George of England before the war shows very clearly how strenuously both France and England strove to ward off the blow that was to stagger civilization. On July 31st President Poincaré wrote to King George of England requesting England to do her best in preserving peace. King George replied:—

"I am personally using my best endeavours with the Emperors of Russia and Germany toward finding some solution by which actual military operations may at any rate be postponed, and time thus be given for calm discussion between the powers. I intend to prosecute these efforts without intermission so long as any hope remains for amicable settlement."

Of course many will turn our attention farther back for the beginning of this war. But wherever you trace in history the activities of the Germanic race you discover unscrupulous efforts in the way of aggression. The German might think that Russian mobilization was the immediate cause, the Russian

"Austria's sharp ultimatum to Servia," and the Austrian might regard "the assassination of the Archduke" as the thing that started it. The French might trace it back to Bismarck's activity in respect to Lorraine, and Germany may point to Louis XIV., but the deep-lying cause was smoldering in the heart of the German people for many centuries. The uncontrollable desire to expand at any cost, the longing for *Weltpolitik,* has always smoldered in the German mind, and in modern days, stimulated by the fire of hatred for Britain, it has flashed forth into a mighty flame. The events of to-day only exemplify a reversion to the primeval state. Cramped within narrow bounds, the mighty energy for conquest has finally burst all its barriers and the terrible octopus at last persistently reaches out its tentacles towards Salonica, Antwerp and Ostend. The "world-wide conspiracy"* of the German Empire is put into practical effect and the whole world suffers because of it.

There are no episodes in this war that have not appeared many, many times in history. The only difference in this conflict is that there are numerous novel instruments of destruction and torture. The Romans had the same trouble with the Germans that we have. Marcus Aurelius and Commodus had their

*"The German War." Sir Arthur Conan Doyle.

hands full in striving to stop them from devastating Italy. And they did devastate Italy more than once. About four hundred years ago they sacked Rome with such barbarity that it will take Italy all her time in this struggle to get even with her ancient enemy.

But this love of conquest and lust for blood were not born out of the blue nor did they arise directly from the devil. Climatic and geographical factors have to be reckoned with in tracing out the subtle and complex roots of these sentiments. The hardest, bleakest and most stepmotherly land in Europe formed the earliest home of the Prussian. The very air he breathed was impregnated with the unconquerable ozone extracted from the boisterous Baltic. Here the Prussian lived and moved and had his being.

Because of the geographical position of Prussia, the country was very hard to defend. It was necessary that the government should be strictly military and that the men should be brought up in the arts of war. American individualism was out of the question, for the simple reason that it was impossible to defend the country under such an ethic. It was necessary to weld the people together as a unit and to teach them the science not only of defence but of conquest. As the country grew

rich and the people strong, the ozone of the Baltic and the necessities of geographical limitations caused them to make unceasing efforts to burst the bonds that so tightly bound them. Now and then a fierce desire to expand seized them as an epidemic, and whenever it did it invariably drenched Europe in blood. This is what has happened in the present war. Over two million men have so far shed their blood upon the battlefield because of the latest outbreak. German love of conquest and desire for expansion must be paid for not merely by thousands but by millions. What a terrible price to pay for an insistent passion nourished and fed in the Prussian bosom! The monster is there; the question is, what shall we do with it? Many footprints lead into his cave and very few out. But it must be destroyed. Napoleon, the greatest military genius, tried to destroy it, but without avail. What Napoleon failed to do in his day the allied powers must do in this. "Prussia must be destroyed!"

In a recent book on the war, Cecil Chesterton traces all the evil methods of it back to "that human vampire," Frederick the Great. Certainly he was a man of degenerate qualities, and instead of possessing those qualities as idiosyncrasies he simply bodied them forth as a true representative of the Prussian race.

The great man of a nation would not be accounted great by a people if he were not a true representative of the deepest thought and impulse of that people. The thoughts and desires and ideals of Bismarck arose from the abysses of the German soul.

If Scipio Africanus ended up nearly every public speech with the remark: "Carthage must be destroyed!" Bismarck said the same in his heart concerning France and England. As long as Bismarck is taken as the ideal man, Germany will be warlike and the common people slaves to a military caste. And doubtless there is much truth in the words of a German writer in the *Gazette de Lille:*

"Each German man and woman, young and old, has in his or her heart an image of Bismarck, a pillar of fire which will support us during the tempestuous days that lie ahead. This fire, revived in each German breast, will be a continued fire of hate, for no one will repeat now the old Biblical phrase: 'Love thy enemy.'

"We have all one great enemy against us—England. The time has passed when we render homage to anything. The English God must punish England. He will punish her. The fire of our just hate is like a fiery cross. Take ten times vengeance for the deaths of your heroes."

CHAPTER II.

THE CONFLICT OF PRINCIPLES.

The criticism has come from a good many sources that Great Britain might have hindered this war. But the whole responsibility of preserving the peace of Europe did not belong to Britain alone. Germany had, without a twinge of conscience, violated the solidarity of Europe by not exercising her power with Austria to advise her to be a little more lenient with Serbia. The Austrian note to Serbia of July 23rd meant war and nothing but war. Germany was well aware of that and yet she lifted not a finger to hinder it. Her own selfish interests were placed far above the interest of others.

On July 22nd, one day before the Austrian note to Serbia, the British Ambassador in Berlin suggested that the matter in dispute between Austria and Serbia be placed before a European tribunal. This was flatly refused by Germany, and the German representatives at the great courts of Europe were notified to this effect. Germany would have war at whatever cost. However, she expressed the hypocritical wish that it would remain localized.

England now made a determined effort to get Germany, France and Italy to take up with herself the work of mediation between Russia and Austria, for the Serbian situation had embroiled the latter in controversy. France, Italy and England agreed to this proposal, but not so Germany. Russia herself offered to allow the four powers in question to settle the case and she would fall in line whatever the decision would turn out to be. This attitude on the part of Russia was perfectly straight-forward and candid.

Russia, however, soon discovered that Germany knew all about the Austrian note, for the ultimatum had previously been telegraphed to the Kaiser, and the latter decided that Austria should have a "perfectly free hand" in respect to the dispute with Serbia. Germany said to Russia: "You must not interfere! Let the two fight it out alone!" But well did Russia see the depravity of the German heart that pretended to think that Russia would not interfere while the Teutonic generals with bounding hearts were holding in leash the "dogs of war" ready to let them loose on the morrow.

The attitude of Russia was clear from the very start. She was willing to have the matter in dispute between Austria and Serbia settled by the agreement of four great powers. Sir

Edward Grey's proposal was a splendid one, having in view not the interest of a nation but the interest of the whole of Europe. He was acting for the world. The Russian Foreign Minister, M. Sazonoff, was willing to accept "any proposal" that would solve the problem provided it did not entirely denationalize Serbia. Germany followed her old policy of the open hand and stiff shoulder. That is, she talked of certain possibilities, an amicable settlement, but obstructed every practical effort put forward towards that end. Russia started a partial mobilization, but her arms were still open to accept any reasonable proposal for peace. As late as July 23rd, Russia offered to stop mobilization if Germany were willing for the powers to settle the question. But Germany, after the preparation of half a century, actually wanted war. What was the use of the vast perfected machinery at her command without a trial? And it was humiliating in the face of all this military perfection to see "a great unwarlike power sprawling Fafnir-wise across the planet." No, the hour had struck for Germany. She must settle accounts with her enemies at once, for to this end her energies had been bent for many years. Thus, while Austria and Russia were on the point of further negotiations, Germany sent her famous ultimatum to Russia, and in a few

days the whole of Europe was struggling in a death-grapple, and no one can foresee, at this date, what the end will be.

Even then Britain was not at war. In answer to a question from the French Ambassador concerning the hope of England's aid, provided the former were attacked by Germany, Sir Edward Grey replied that so far as he could see then, England would not intervene. Again, England suggested to Germany that if by any reasonable statement she could show that she was trying to preserve the peace of Europe, England would wash her hands clean of the consequences.

Then came from Germany to England the most infamous proposal that ever came from a civilized nation. England was to remain neutral, and as a reward for her neutrality Germany would demand no "territorial acquisitions" from France, but would severely punish her and probably strip her of her colonies. The integrity of the Netherlands would be respected provided Germany's enemies did the same, but the Teutonic armies would need to pass through Belgium in order to have easy access to France. If Belgium stood passively by, however, and looked on without lifting a finger to stop the trampling down of her country, she would be rewarded at the end of the war. Bound up in it all, as

Sir Edward Grey clearly saw, was the intention of completely crushing France so that she could "never again come across"* the Teutonic "path."

Such a dastardly proposal could only be made by a dastardly nation. England was called upon to barter away her sacred obligations. She was requested to do a thing which would have forever stamped her as a craven nation not fit any longer to exist. Sir Edward Grey, with quick intuition, saw that the most degraded Briton would not stand for such an action. She would protect Belgium, the weak nation. France also said that she was one with England in this respect.

Notwithstanding the treaties of 1839 and 1870, Germany definitely proposed to Belgium on August 2nd, that she allow German troops to pass through her territory. Belgium refused, and instantly she was set down in the German mind as an enemy and in a few days hostile guns were pounding at the gates of Liège. This was the crime that roused the old lion from his slumbers. Before this, in respect to France, her only agreement was to employ the British navy, if the German fleet attempted to attack the French coast or French shipping. Certainly her honour was at

*"Germany and the Next War," page 106. Bernhardi.

stake when war was declared against her allies, Russia and France, but she was hoping against hope that God would open a way for her to do the right and yet remain neutral. However, the breaking in of the enemy upon Belgian soil decided at once the mind of England. She took up arms, and every subject to the farthest corner of her world-wide empire will eternally bless her for doing so.

It was not merely a "scrap of paper" that bound England to Belgium. The German philosophical mind, impregnated with the Platonic tradition, if it had not been blinded by selfishness and lust of conquest, could have easily seen that the piece of paper was only a bare symbol, a phenomenal manifestation of a reality that belonged to the ideal world. The paper itself with certain ink-marks and official seals upon it was only an external symptom of the great eternal principle expressed by the word "honour." Surely the German mind "debauched with learning" had no difficulty in understanding this! Yet the German Chancellor remarked to the British Ambassador at Berlin: "Is it so that just for a scrap of paper Great Britain is going to make war upon a kindred nation?"

For England, although falsely regarded by Germany as entirely utilitarian in her principles, the position she took was the inevitable

one. She could do no other and preserve her honour. She had always stood for the "inviolability and the self-respect of the weaker nations of the world." She had often shed her blood in this cause and she would not be backward now. Her ancient honour was knocking loudly at the door. She had given Belgium her pledge that the integrity of her territory would be respected into whatever quarrels the other European nations might enter. Now a barbarous nation was not only violating her own obligation, but daring England to hinder the outrage. For a nation with British blood there was but one path to pursue and that England took without hesitation.

Germany defends her warfare by the Machiavellian principle that military necessity knows no law. Thus, when a nation enters war she finds it very difficult to obey the rules and laws that obtain in times of peace. War is the acknowledgment of the failure of law and restraint. It is the failure of moral rules in general. But there is one law that the most barbarous nations from time immemorial have always respected, from the cave-man down until now, and that is that innocent non-combatants, who are unable to defend themselves, should not be molested. In battle, almost any means may be used to gain victory, but when the sword is used

against innocent women and children and unarmed persons in general, the struggle leaves the category of legitimate warfare and becomes cold-blooded murder. If, then, because of modern science there can be no war without murder, and no nation knew this better than Germany, this fact makes the murderer-nation still more culpable and will always brand her with infamy for initiating this world-struggle.

The primal causes of this war go back to the difference of principles and the undue emphasis of one nation upon its differentiating ideals, resulting finally in hatred. A nation may not be accountable for its inherited principles, but it can be held accountable for the stand it takes in reference to these principles. If it chooses not to be tolerant, in a pragmatic sense, in respect to the principles of other nations it will be led into trouble, according to the importance it attaches to its own leading principles. The German mind, always absolutistic and biased on the side of "eternal values," is prone to consider its principles as above all others in value not only for itself but for the world in general. Because of this tendency no true pragmatist exists in Germany to-day, although Professor Ostwald has said many things with a pragmatistic tendency. For Germany a principle is not something that can be placed on one side when its

day is over. Its day is never over. It is eternal. The logical step is the imposing of the principle upon others. Surely if a principle belongs to the structure of existence itself, a nation has every reason to impose it upon others even by force of arms. And was not England putting herself in the way of the carrying out of such a plan? Thus undue emphasis upon the importance of a national principle combined with the thought that one great nation "sprawling Fafnir-wise across the planet" was terribly hindering it, led to hate, and hate led to persistent preparation for war and finally precipitated the struggle.

Thus we have placed our finger exactly upon the artery of the cause of the war. The assassination of the Archduke, the ultimatum to Serbia, the partial mobilization of Russia and the opposition of England were only occasions of the war, the bare outside activities which seemed to remove the last stone from the path of least resistance. The causes lay buried deep in the Teutonic consciousness and had memories reaching back beyond the time of Bismarck.

In the middle of the nineteenth century there was a struggle between those who clung to the principle of liberalism and those who held the principle of autocracy. Who shall rule, the King or the people? That was the

insistent question. It was asked everywhere and on every side. But Bismarck, with his great, overmastering personality, answered the question once and for all for the German people. "The Crown," he says, "must rule now and forever or else our nation must be shattered into a meteoric shower." Thus "Liberalism" suffered a "catastrophic defeat"* from which it has never recovered, at least in the German mind. The iron hand of Bismarck shattered democracy once for all for the Teutonic will, and to-day the German citizen knows little of freedom and personal responsibility for actions, so that even Mommsen writes concerning Germany, "There are no longer free citizens."

This great conflict, therefore, is a struggle between principles that are directly opposed to one another. Liberty is the principle that rules all the civilized world outside of Germany, and autocracy is the principle dear to the heart of the Prussian rulers and officers. The rank weeds of autocracy have been sown in many lands, but no soil seems to be so favorable for it as the Prussian. Under the careful cultivation of the Kaisers and the Prussian aristocracy in general, the seeds have taken strong root and the harvest is now

*"Imperial Germany," page 120. Prince Buelow.

being reaped from the bloody fields of Belgium and Poland. England and her allies have always held that no nation should interfere with another, that no nation should enslave or rob another, but that every nation should have liberty to go its own way and work out its own salvation in peace. Not so with Germany. Germany must have the ascendancy. "We must," says Bernhardi, "endeavor to obtain in this system our merited position at the head of a federation of Central European states, and thus reduce the imaginary European equilibrium." "It is the curse of a people to be quite engrossed in social life and lose the taste for political greatness."* The great object of the State is acknowledged to be "power," and in order that this may be attained and retained great attention must be given to the "organization of the army." This is necessary, for "without war there would be no State at all." But everyone in the State must render implicit obedience to the rulers. "The individual must forget his own ego and feel himself a member of the whole; he must recognize what a nothing his life is in comparison with the general welfare."

The great autocratic principle must be upheld at any price. The individual must lose

*"Selections from Treitschke's Lectures on Politics," page 20, by Adam L. Gowans.

himself in order that it may be carried forward. It must not only prevail in Germany but be imposed upon the world. This is the real belief of the German rulers, but it is cunningly covered over so that the ordinary man cannot see it.

The great German lie that is used for this purpose is expressed by Münsterberg in many places in his latest book, as for instance: "But politically it is, after all, England's war against Germany in which both Russia's desire for expansion and France's longing for vengeance were harnessed for the purpose of the British Empire." Again he refers to how "England led the preparations with masterly diplomacy," and brings his arguments, if arguments they are, to a climax by the words: "Germany was dragged into this war by the will of the three enemies who have worked and worked until Central Europe was encircled and until the hour for a crushing blow to Germany seemed to have come."* "Germany would never have chosen the war."

Compare these statements with those of Herr Harden, who indeed suffered greatly because he dared to depart from the beaten path and astonish the Prussian mind with truth. It is well known that in his "Zukunft"

*"The Peace and America," page 148. Münsterberg.

he criticized severely certain men high in the Kaiser's favour and sustained the criticisms in the face of the influence of these privileged persons. He stands to-day, it is said, the most influential journalist in Germany. His words are as follows:

"Let us drop our miserable attempt to excuse Germany's action. Let us have done with paltry abuse of the enemy. Not against our will, and as a nation taken by surprise, did we hurl ourselves into this gigantic venture.

"We willed it; we had to will it. We do not stand before the Judgment-seat of Europe; we acknowledge no such jurisdiction.

"Our might shall create a new law in Europe. It is Germany that strikes. When she has conquered new domains for her genius, then the priesthoods of all the gods will praise the god of war. We stand at the beginning of a struggle whose development and duration no one can foretell, and in which as yet no combatant has been overwhelmed.

"Now Germany's hour has struck, and she must take her place as the leading Power.

"Any peace which did not secure her the first position would be no reward for her efforts."

This man cries out with all his strength to Germany to place herself in her true light

before the world. She has brought about this war. She has coveted the strength and expansion of England. She must have the "first position" among the nations of the world. This is no hypothetical imperative for the Teutonic mind. It is categorical to the very last degree and runs in the Prussian blood. Germany is but carrying to its logical conclusion the autocratic ideal that for many years has obsessed the German soul.

The unscrupulous Bismarck was the very embodiment of this ideal. His stern policy gained the ascendancy in his day and has never ceased to fascinate the Prussian mind. The State, for him, was a circumscribed entity. It narrowed itself down to a few Prussian statesmen. The average citizen was not so much a part of it as its tool. It was a separate entity and existed by the "grace of God." The nation was a different thing from the government and existed only as a field of activity for the government.* Obedience was the great virtue required of the individuals of a nation. Submission was demanded and the people fell in line when they preceived that after all it worked well or was successful.

Certainly there "was a time" when Bismarckian policy was needed and that was in

*"Evolution of Modern Germany," page 431. W. H. Dawson.

the years preceding the founding of the Empire. The parts of Germany were then disjointed and ready to fall apart and the French power was threatening its very existence. But after those trying days there was no longer need of the policy of rigour and vigour. The two great German wars of the nineteenth century were acknowledged to be wars of liberation and essential to the unity of the German States. But Germany once upon its feet should have learned the lesson of democracy and should never have allowed the Empire to reach such a state that only someone equal to Bismarck or Napoleon could save it.

What now is the situation? Dominance is the only weighty word in Germany. It has been so since the days of Bismarck, who did his work wonderfully well. The Prussian hath said in his heart: "To external authority every knee shall bow." This one idea has filled the consciousness of the ruling caste. And the strange thing about it is: to-day the German cannot succeed without it. Take away the element of strict obedience to external power and you at once witness a shattered people with not enough initiative to successfully carry on any serious struggle.

Now, the British political organization is founded upon laws diametrically different

from those of the Germans. England does not first construct a goddess of power and then demand that all fall down and worship the graven image that she has set up. She takes her stand upon practice and upon efficiency. The English mind is pragmatic. It asks concerning results and seeks to vindicate its principles by trying them in the crucible of practice. This does not mean that she is wholly given up to Utilitarianism. It means that she is willing to modify her principles if they prove to be destructive, in the long run. There is no good, she believes, that is not voluntary. The function of the State is representation, not ipsedixitism. The latter must freely express the wishes of the many and only thus can it speak with authority. Freedom is the ruling word in such a State, and yet it is not a freedom without law, but a freedom that wills according to law. This principle has carried its healing influence to all parts of the British domains and under its power a mighty army that astonishes the world has arisen in less than a year to meet the battalions of a strong invader.

To leave for a moment the treatment of the principles involved, it might be said that once the war was precipitated not only obligations of honour but those of self-interest compelled

England to lend assistance to France against a great and overwhelming power. France had to be protected, for if she were crushed England herself would be isolated in Europe and at the mercy of the enemy. Thus self-interest changed into self-defence, for he who runs can see and understand that with France upon her knees, England would herself soon take an attitude of supplication.

Although there was an agreement between the two countries, this obligation did not bind England to help France in the event of war, as the Austro-German treaty bound the nations involved to use the whole of their armed forces together if attacked by Russia. But England would not allow France to be crushed with impunity, because not only did she desire to save France, but she wished to preserve herself. Of her own free will she decided to take her stand by the side of the flower of modern civilization and hinder it from being entirely uprooted, for this was the intention of the enemy. Below the written treaty and the obligations there embodied, were deeper sentiments expressed by the terms friendship and self-preservation. Friendship always lays a certain burden upon the individuals or nations involved, but self-preservation is a deeper motive than that of friendship. England felt and knew from the begin-

ning of this war that the stroke was aimed at her own heart, and she acted accordingly.

We can say with all assurance that Great Britain had no desire for war. If she had contemplated war she would never have been content with a "contemptible little army." Her navy was, of course, necessary for her very existence. But war with a great power was remote from her mind. If England "led the preparations" for war "with masterly diplomacy,"* as Münsterberg would have us believe, why was she content with such a small land force and why did she plead with a quivering voice that peace should be preserved when Austria, with the connivance of Germany, was preparing the ultimatum that would have denationalized Serbia? On the other hand, if the *Kulturstaat*† of Germany "respects the nationalities of others" and is a "natural bearer of peace," and if "Germany does not desire the subjection of any non-German people," why the immense preparations for war extending throughout many years? If this contention be correct, why has the whole of science been so efficiently harnessed by the Teutonic nation for the destruction of life?

---

*"The Peace and America," page 149. Münsterberg.

†*Ibid.*, page 151.

If "ten *Lusitanias*" would willingly be sacrificed for one German life, certainly it was never intended that Zeppelins, poisonous gases, liquid fire and other destructive weapons should be used against German citizens. No, the design was to use the engines of destruction against "non-German people," and to carry out what Mirabeau called "Prussia's national industry," namely, war.

The words of the Crown Prince to Mr. Ian Malcolm, who had been in the diplomatic service in Berlin, make this very clear:

"You English and we ought to be friends and divide Europe between us. And we can do it if you will just shut your eyes and let us take the French colonies." Mr. Malcolm answered: "I think you had better try to make a success of the colonies you have before you take other people's. You must remember that such a proceeding as you suggest would mean war, and nobody wants war." Gripping his arm, the Crown Prince said, "I beg your pardon, I want war. I want to smack those French swine."

England, then, went to war to preserve her principle of freedom, to defend the idea of European solidarity, to vindicate the claims of friendship and to respect international treaties. Neutrality would have meant the crushing of France, the spoliation of Belgium

and a hostile nation at the front door. She might have been willing to pay that price for continued peace after a short war in which accounts would have been settled with France and Russia. But would peace have come then? If the pronouncement of the Reichstag in 1909, concerning the expropriation of Polish landlords, namely, that "in political matters might goes before right" expresses the German viewpoint, and we know it does, England would have been attacked after the successful struggle with these two nations, and she would have had to fight alone. Germany simply wanted her to wait until her best friends were gone and then fight single-handed for existence. The keen English mind saw through this German-made scheme and decided to fight.

Whatever we may think of England's foreign policy in the past, we are convinced in every drop of our blood that she is right now. She is fighting militarism, imperialism and autocracy. She is struggling for democracy and liberty, and every British subject in every part of the Empire will stand by her in the struggle.

CHAPTER III.

KULTUR.

It is strange, very strange, that a cultured man should allow himself to be carried away as the author of "The Peace and America" allowed himself to be carried off his feet by the flag-waving of a few hundred American citizens, who, no doubt, had German blood in their veins. If there were four thousand American citizens present at the "great neutrality meeting in Boston's classical Symphony Hall," it is probably hyperbolic to say that "four thousand waved little American flags whenever the speakers shouted their indignation at England's arrogance," for, after all, there was one, at least, that rebelled and cried out: "How about German militarism and German culture?" This one must have had a good backing or else he would not have propounded such a question. Why, let me ask, did three thousand Germans assemble in Berlin three days before the war and protest with all their might against it if they were convinced that England was arrogant? Again, why did fourteen thousand people gather in Hyde Park, London, at the same time, to pro-

test against war and so change as to be unanimous in its favour two days after the wicked invasion of Belgium?

Was it not German arrogance and German cruelty that turned the tide of opinion in England within two or three days? The vast majority of Englishmen were opposed to the war until Belgium was made the tramping-ground of a vast German army. Then the "arrogant" English protested with the sword, for there was no other way open, and all England found itself in favor of a war of protection, a war to enforce respect for international treaties—a war against militarism and all that was involved in it. With clean hands and a pure heart Britain entered the conflict seeking no territory, no renown and not even military glory. It is, thus, a righteous war, and even Christian, for did not "the meek and lowly" Carpenter take the whip of small cords and drive the materialists out of the Temple? He drove them out with a whip, for they would go by no other means. That is, persuasion could not move them, and He thus drove them out. Similar practical materialists have invaded Belgium, and nothing but the whip of Britannia and her Allies can drive them out.

But to return to Kultur, we are exceedingly relieved to know that it does not demand "inner perfection." After all, this is just

what we thought, for we have been looking in vain ever since the war began for outward manifestations of some kind of inner perfection on the part of the aggressors. We are somewhat proud also to know that it is not, as relating to the Germans, "a special object of glory or of praise." A nation cannot help its Kultur. Herein lies an excuse for Germany. The domain of national Kultur includes the literature and science, scholarship, religion and morality of a people. No doubt this is true.

All must acknowledge the debt they owe to German Kultur. It was certainly no "self-deception" when all nations "went up" to Germany to learn its methods of social reform, its philosophy and its music. Such scholars as Humboldt, Helmholtz, Koch, Behring, Mommsen, Wundt, Harnack and many others are cosmopolitan. There is no touch of provincialism about them. No one refuses them intellectual preëminence. There ought to be a way of making German intellectual power prevail without adding material dominion to it. But Germany is not satisfied with intellectual dominion. She must have the whole or none. It must be in the oft-repeated words of Bernhardi: "Empire or downfall (*Weltmacht oder Niedergang*)." Her whole education for forty years has taught her this, and

having put her hand to the plough she scorns to turn back.

Professor Mather may be right after all in his remark that "measured by the production of cultured individuals Germany takes a comparatively low place among the nations." France, England, Italy and Spain have contributed largely to the intellectual wealth of nations. Germany's intellectual superiority is, we might say, in depth but not in respect to the number of intellectual individuals produced. Germany has had and still has some cultured individuals. It cannot be said that she overtops every other nation in respect to the number of such individuals, but those that stand out before the eyes of the world are super-individuals in their several spheres. Germany hardly excels in the Humanities, much less in humanity. What is referred to here is the broad human learning that marks the French, English, Italian and American peoples. To lay stress upon the old signification of the word, Germany excels in the Divinities rather than in the Humanities, yet she is by no means divine. She excels in speculation and theoretical productions. The general influence of Kant, Schelling, Fichte and Hegel is still regnant in the world and will continue to stir men's minds until the end of time.

But Germany is by no means exclusive in the field of philosophy. France has had its large share in this field. Abelard, the pupil of the great controversialist, William of Champeaux, in the beginning of the twelfth century started a mighty train of thought that was carried on in Bernard of Chartres, in William of Conches and in Gilbert de la Porrée, Bishop of Poitiers, and even in the German-born Hugo of St. Victor. The surprising boldness of thought and penetrating power that mark the works of these men are a wonder to the reader of to-day. Then, carrying forward the Peripatetic tradition in the thirteenth century, we have William of Auvergne, who, under the spell of the master, wrote the voluminous work "De Universo"; and the Dominican Vincent of Beauvais displays a marvellous grasp of all the works of the Stagirite.

Of the seventeenth century philosophers, Descartes is an outstanding figure. A mathematician, a philosopher and one of the founders of analytical geometry, he introduced the method of inner observation and was also a learned anatomist and physiologist. The rationalistic Descartes passed along his intellectual impulse through Locke and Hume to Kant, the seer of Königsberg, for he drew a broad line between the ideas of material qualities and their external causes. Other

upholders of his standard were Malebranche and the noted Spinoza, the Jew of Amsterdam, of whom Renan said on the occasion of the dedication of his statue at The Hague in 1882: "This man, from his granite pedestal, will point to all men the way of blessedness which he found; and ages hence, the cultivated traveller, passing by this spot, will say in his heart, 'The truest vision ever had of God came, perhaps, here.'"

Every student of the History of Philosophy knows that the heart of the Leibnitzian system, namely, the theory of monads, was in conception as well as in name derived from Bruno's "De Triplice Minimo et Mensura" and "De Monade, Numero et Figura," and that Leibnitz found more food for thought and satisfaction in the French Descartes than in any other philosopher, not excepting Aristotle. It might have been, in part, his admiration for French philosophy that prompted him at one time to lay before Louis XIV. a plan for the conquest of Egypt, showing how the power of France could be greatly increased and at the same time turned aside from the ambitious consideration of German affairs. Again, the advisability of breaking the power of the unspeakable Turk was pointed out. Thus, even the philosopher of that day with the true German spirit

turned aside from his more intellectual work to advise material conquest.

Then look at the galaxy of thinkers in France in the eighteenth century: Voltaire, Rousseau, Condillac, Helvetius, Diderot, D'Alembert, Robinet, Julien Offroy de la Mettrie, Charles Bonnet, Abbé Morelly, Baron von Holbach, Buffon, and the political economists Turgot and Condorcet. True, the modern Hegelian would brand these men as rank materialists and turn up his nose at them. The "Système de la Nature" of Baron von Holbach would be regarded as nothing but a complete theory of ontological and psychological materialism. Everything in the writings of these men would be included under the categories of matter and motion. Ah, but what is German Pantheism? Is it not bare materialism baptized with a new name to rub off the edges of the latter and make it a little softer? Pantheism simply takes the universe as it is, alters nothing, but claps the word God upon it and retires to rest and allows the trap to do its work in respect to the minds of men. By calling philosophical Materialism bad names, such as "mud-philosophy," the Pantheists have sought to cover over the weakness of their own theories. Has not Spencer shown us that matter is by no means crude, but is, as James remarks, "infinitely and incredibly re-

fined"? We are by no means defending Materialism, but pointing out that the French Materialism of the eighteenth century was about as good as the German Pantheism of the twentieth. The Pantheist sees God everywhere, giving Him the praise for all events, while the Materialist attributes the movement of things to a mechanical Universe.

Time would fail to tell of Renouvier, who saw the glory of Kant even when the latter was neglected in his own country, and Taine, Renan and Schérer, who represented the *positivisme des savants,* also Royer-Collard, Maine de Biran, Theodore Jouffroy, and last, but not least, Victor Cousin, supporting Cartesian spiritualism in France in the nineteenth century.

In our own day we have as a great outstanding figure Henri Bergson, of whom Le Roy remarks in his book on Bergson's philosophy: "We are able to pronounce the revolution which it (his philosophy) effects equal in importance to that effected by Kant, or even by Socrates."

Among great orators in modern times, Bossuet stands out as a splendid specimen. H. Morse Stephens remarks concerning him: "In the simple grandeur of his language (he) stands alone among the orators of the golden age of French pulpit eloquence." His works

appear in thirty-one volumes. Then we have Bourdalone and Fénelon, Massillon and Mirabeau, Danton and Robespierre, Lamartine and Gambetta, the latter of whom had as much reason to resent German militarism as any Frenchman of to-day, for in the midst of a German invasion he escaped from Paris in a balloon. Then in modern days we have Jaurès, who, on one occasion, amid the disorders of the French Chamber, while debating on Socialism with Clemenceau, made a speech of such rhetorical splendor, sincerity and enthusiasm, that it made a profound impression, not only throughout the length and breadth of France, but throughout the world. The brilliant and caustic Clemenceau himself, in his reply to Jaurès, so riddled him that he brought forth from the latter the complaint that he was "all bristling with barbs, launched at me by a hand skilful and always young."

We must admit, then, that there is a great deal of exaggeration in the statement that Germany excels in every line of thought. To take the statement at its face value is apt to lead us into great misconceptions. The German is a great robber even in the field of science and philosophy, notwithstanding Münsterberg's flourish before us of such names as Humboldt, Helmholtz, Koch, Behring, Ranke, Mommsen, Wundt, Harnack, Kant, Hegel and Shelling.

These are doubtless great names, but they are not the greatest.

In the field of pure mechanical invention Germany has shown very little originality. When a man was needed to make vast improvements in the steam engine, Germany could not produce him. From Greenock, in Scotland, came forth James Watt, the distinguished son of an industrious tradesman, and a maker of mathematical instruments. His inventions have resulted in great good for humanity.

Germany boasts loudly of her great Dreadnaughts, but it was Robert Fulton, of Little Britain, Penn., a man of Irish descent, who made it possible for her to possess a steamer at all. Up to 1807 the invention of a vessel propelled by steam was regarded as an utter impossibility. But Fulton harnessed steam to a propeller and installed the whole into the *Clermont* and pushed her up the Hudson from New York City to Albany, a distance of one hundred and fifty miles, in thirty-two hours. Before Fulton died there were five successful steamboats on the river.

Germany could do but little on the sea today without her submarines. It was David Bushnell, however, who constructed the first practical submarine boat, while Robert Fulton, by vast improvements, ensured its permanent place in naval warfare. Also it was a Swede,

a son of a mining proprietor, who gave to the world the screw-propeller, which revolutionized navigation, and is found necessary for successful ocean travel to-day.

The Teutons have been able to work great destruction upon the French in Belgium and the Russians in Poland because of the possession of a great number of machine-guns. But the machine-gun was not invented in Germany but in the United States, by Richard John Gatling. The idea was first conceived in 1861 and in 1862 the gun was given a test in the presence of army officers. This gun could discharge three hundred and fifty shots in a minute. Although crude compared with the modern machine-gun, yet Gatling's invention has made possible the modern machine-guns used so successfully at the front.

When a genius was needed to lay the telegraphic cable across the ocean, in order to make possible German information from the United States, Canada and Newfoundland, the world was compelled to look to Stockbridge, Mass., for the man. Cyrus W. Field conceived the idea that the telegraph might be made to span the Atlantic Ocean. After twelve years' work and five discouraging attempts, the cable was laid and the sea was no longer a barrier to German thought and purposes. When later a man was needed to use the imponderable

ether as a medium by which information could be transmitted across the great oceans, Guglielmo Marconi, born at Bologna, Italy, came forward, and in 1901 signals across the Atlantic—a distance of over two thousand miles —were received for the first time. Now the Teutons are using the wireless system on all their battleships, thanks to Marconi.

The ordinary German soldier does not realize that it was Samuel Colt, of Hartford, Conn., that made it possible for him to use revolving firearms that are of such value in his attack upon his enemies. Nor do the officers of the German army understand that the very telephone that they are using in the trenches as a means of gaining information concerning the enemy was patented by Alexander Graham Bell, an American scientist and inventor, who was born in Edinburgh, Scotland, but took out his patent for the telephone while professor of vocal physiology in Boston University.

It would also be well for the uninformed to learn that Thomas Alva Edison, an American inventor, made improvements on the telephone that the whole world has gratefully acknowledged. After experimenting for nine years this man also invented a system of incandescent illumination which is more extensively used in Berlin than in Boston.

In the field of surgery and therapeutics the Germans have by no means kept pace with the English-speaking peoples. It was left to Lord Joseph Lister, who was born at Upton, Essex, Professor of Surgery at Glasgow University, and afterward teacher of clinical surgery at Edinburgh, to revolutionize surgery by the discovery of the antiseptic system of treatment that has been the means of saving an untold number of lives.

About the same time Sir James Young Simpson, a Scottish physician and professor in the University of Edinburgh, discovered the anaesthetic properties of chloroform, for which he was created a baronet in 1866. This discovery has been an inestimable boon to humanity, and will be to the end of time.

Emile Verhaeren, the Belgian poet, has clearly shown us in a recent article on "The Uncivilized Nation," that the German invents hardly anything, but takes the inventions of other people and works upon them. He is like the bird that lays its egg in the nest of another and then, when the builder of the nest appears, drives it off and sings its song of triumph.

The German does not live in the atmosphere of pure invention, hence he finds it hard to produce. He accepts the task imposed upon him and asks no questions. Neither Leibnitz nor Kant would have been greatly successful

without Descartes, nor would Haeckel without Darwin, or Koch and Behring without Pasteur.

Where, then, is the justification in calling the Teuton the super-man? Capacity for shedding blood and plundering, ability to loot and steal, surely should not entitle him to the name. And yet he excels in these more than in anything else.

Germany has never produced a soldier equal to Napoleon, and the speeches of the latter before the French soldiers have a higher tone than those of Frederick the Great to his Generals. Napoleon appeals to the heart, and wins the enthusiastic favour of his soldiers; Frederick shakes the mailed fist after the German manner, and drives them forward. Thus, to his generals before the battle of Leuthen he says: "But if there should be one or another who dreads to share all dangers with me, he can have his discharge this evening," etc. Again the blustering Prussian shouts: "The cavalry regiment that does not on this instant, on orders given, dash full plunge into the enemy, I will, directly after the battle, unhorse and make it a garrison regiment. The infantry battalion which, meet with what it may, shows the least sign of hesitancy, loses its colours and its sabres, and I cut the trimmings from its uniform!"

Consider Napoleon addressing his army in Italy: "Friends, I promise you that glorious conquest; but be the liberators of peoples, be not their scourges!" Again, to the same army: "To you, soldiers, will belong the immortal honour of redeeming the fairest portion of Europe. The French people, free and respected by the whole world, shall give to Europe a glorious peace, which shall indemnify it for all the sacrifices which it has borne for the last six years. Then by your firesides you shall repose; and your fellow citizens when they point out any one of you shall say: 'He belonged to the army of Italy.'" Again, Thiers relates to us how Napoleon addressed his army in Egypt. He says, referring to the great marching army, suddenly there flashed upon their gaze the "gigantic pyramids gilded by the sun," and then they "halted as if seized with curiosity and admiration." With his face "beaming with enthusiasm" the great Napoleon "began to gallop before the ranks of the soldiers," and, with finger pointing to the pyramids, he shouted: "Consider that from the summits of these pyramids forty centuries have their eyes fixed upon you!"

While Napoleon appealed to the hearts of men the German generals usually made use of the lever of fear. German soldiers to-day are in positive terror of their officers, who be-

have with a kind of studied truculence more befitting slave-drivers than leaders of men. This is borne out by the fact that a sample of cat-o'-nine-tails was found at Neuve Chappelle. Also numerous other evidences of the same characteristic have come to light. A deserter from the German lines reported to the English authorities that the great force deterring many of the men of his regiment from becoming deserters was the fact that they were peasant proprietors in South Germany to whom desertion would mean the loss of everything they possessed. The men are ruled by fear to a great extent, and because of this do not even speak to one another concerning their grievances. At sight of an officer, who is often a brainless, pompous know-nothing, the miserable men must spring to attention and remain in appropriate position without moving a muscle during the quarter or half-hour while the officer is near.

Although the method of bullying and the exercise of brute force have had a degrading effect upon the soldiers, yet their officers have filled their minds with the thought of their invincibility and given them the notion that they are superior to the whole world. So the German soldier shouts, "*Deutschland über Alles!*"

We are living in a pragmatic age, an age that judges by external activities. How are we going to judge Germany? We have read some of the works of her great philosophers and historians, and have been well pleased with the ideas set forth. The majority of these have expressed high ideals, but have not at the same time suggested that those ideals should be imposed at whatever cost upon reluctant humanity. They were content to theorize and work, and work and theorize. But Prussian militarism is an abnormal growth upon the heart of Germany. It only represents its lower soul and not its higher. Just as in the individual consciousness, often sensuous ideas gain the upper hand, and strangle, for the time being, the higher and purer ideals, so it is in the soul of a nation.

Aristotle's conception of the divided soul easily finds modern representation for what he means. The soul, taught Aristotle, in so far as it is sensation, memory, will, etc., is of the earth "earthy." It suffers the fate of the body;* it is of a perishable nature (*φθαρτός*). The entire passive side of the intelligence, the lower sensuous part (*νοῦς παθητικός*) passes with the body and is of like nature with the soul of the animal. The active

*De Anima, III, 5. Aristotle.

intellect (*νοῦς ποιητικός*) only has immortality. This latter is not a mere function, but an actual being that lives on when the lower part of the soul goes out as a candle. Existing before the sensible soul, the active and pure intellect only stoops to join the body for a particular purpose. This is the immortal part. This is the divine part, and in the most cultured individuals it always rules the lower. The animal soul is always struggling for supremacy, and often it takes the lead and predominates in the individual.

Now this is just what is happening in Germany to-day. Modern psychology does not refer much to Aristotle, yet every psychologist acknowledges that events occur in the soul of a nation as well as in the consciousness of an individual, analogous to the phenomena described by the Stagirite. The higher soul of Germany, the immortal part (*νοῦς ποιητικός*), certainly has been made manifest in the production of her theologians, philosophers, musicians and scientists. They have given to the world a representation of Kultur in its third and more general meaning. They have clearly presented the characteristics of the higher soul of the nation, for that higher soul shows itself in the "science, art, literature, morality and religion of a people."

The Kaiser is said to be a symbol of the national soul of Germany. To call him a good man calls for a definition of goodness, and the definition of goodness for a people is all covered over with the pale cast of their traditions, history and past ideals. The Kaiser is a good man if you mean by "good" useful for the fostering of the Prussian military spirit. He is good if you mean by "good" a true specimen or representation or symbol of a nation's under-soul or intelligence (*νοῦς παθητικός*). The Prussian spirit is symbolized in him. He has imagined a great German Empire, including Belgium, Switzerland and France on the west and a large strip of Russia on the east. He has imagined Germany leading the whole world in art, science, and philosophy, and he has thought that in order to realize this a mighty army was necessary. In all this he has symbolized the under-soul of the German people. The higher soul of Germany, represented by Kant, Herder, Jacobi, Fries, Schiller, Reinhold, Fichte, Shelling and Hegel, finds no representation whatever in the Kaiser. It is always the military under-soul that speaks in him. "Germany is right," he says, "and Germany must impose its conception of right upon other nations. She must spread her doctrine as far west as the British Isles and as far east as the utmost boundary of Russia.

And as the end justifies the means, the most brutal acts of inhumanity are allowable."

What would Kant say to this dictum? The ends which it is our duty to have, says Kant, in essence, are *our own perfection and the happiness of others.* This applies to a nation as well as to an individual. "Ah," but the German retorts, "what he meant was that we should strive for the happiness of others according to *our* ideas as to what is best for our neighbours. We are not bound to give them what they desire, for they are usually wrong and desire wrong things. We must give them what *we* think is best for their ultimate happiness, although now it is a bitter pill for them to swallow." Thus it seems best for Germans to become pirates of the sea and murderers of the worst kind, in order that happiness may come to others. Thus we have the picture of several submarines lying in wait for the giant liner, *Lusitania,* in order that a thousand lives of non-combatants, including many women and innocent children, may be taken so that ultimately happiness may come to the Allies. We have the picture of a mighty ship, worth ten million dollars, and carrying over two thousand people, shattered to pieces within sight of land and the submarines hurrying away allowing the women and children to drown like rats, and all

this for the ultimate welfare of the Allies. What a blot on the name of Germany! All nations will now call her an outlaw and every hand will be turned against her. Written in large letters over half of Europe, revealed in the ruins of Louvain, disclosed in the crumbling walls of Rheims, expressed in the terrible record of the frightful atrocities committed through several months of war is the thought: Deepest barbarism is still in the hearts of the German people. This is the Kantian exaltation of respect for the rights of man as an unconditional duty above the "sweet feeling of doing good," when "mankind" is defined as the German people. It is fulfilling the conditions of "Lasting Peace"* of which Kant so earnestly spoke, when the expression "Lasting Peace" is conceived to refer only to the Kingdom represented by the Holy German Empire. It is the carrying out of the "Gentle tone"† in the struggle for Empire when this attitude is regarded only as necessary in respect to Prussian generals and officers. Surely the radical evil in human nature (*Das radicale Böse in der Menschennatur*) of which the Seer of Königsberg was so fond of speaking has come to the front with a ven-

*See Essay on "Lasting Peace" (Kant) Rosenkranz & Schubert's Ed. VII., 1, page 290.

†"Gentle Tone in Philosophy" (Kant) Ibid. Vol. I, p. 622.

geance in the latest achievements of the German soldiers, and all the idealism of the German philosophers has been helpless before it. If the tree is known by its fruits, and a greater than Münsterberg has told us this, then the particular idealism of the German military caste is bound to be buried at last in well-merited oblivion and give place to a truer idealism.

The struggle of the good and evil principles* (*Der Kampf des guten und bösen Princips*) has evidently been going on for the last forty years. The good principle has insisted: "Act only on that maxim whereby thou canst at the same time will that it should become a universal law,"† the evil principle has said in the true spirit of Niccolo Machiavelli: "Seek Empire at whatever cost. It will doubtless drench the world in blood. It will make millions of orphans and widows. It will turn back the clock of civilization one hundred years. It will necessitate the trampling of Belgium in the dust, the crushing of France, so that she will never cross the Teutonic path again. It will also mean the strangling of Britain. Yet it must be done, for the end

*"Geschichte der neuern Philosophie," Vol. V, page 331. Kuno Fischer.

†Kant's "Theory of Ethics," Fifth Ed., page 38. Abbott.

justifies the means." The good principle recommended the gradual cessation of war preparation and suppression of the military spirit, for that is what it desired among non-German peoples; the evil principle constantly said with Neitzsche, Treitschke and Friedrich von Bernhardi: "Might is right, for 'it has always been the weary, spiritless and exhausted ages which have played with the dream of perpetual peace.'"

The good principle insisted: "You must allow peace and harmony to prevail, for this is what is desired among all nations"; the evil principle replied in the words of General von Bernhardi: "War is a biological necessity of the first importance, a regulative element in the life of mankind, which cannot be dispensed with, since without war an unhealthy development will follow which excludes every advancement of the race, and therefore all real civilization. . . . Might is at once the supreme right, and the dispute as to what is right is decided by the arbitrament of war."* "In all times the right of conquest by war has been admitted. It may be that a growing people cannot win colonies from uncivilized races, and yet the State wishes to retain the surplus population which the

*"Germany and the Next War," page 17. Friedrich von Bernhardi.

Mother Country can no longer feed. Then the only course left is to acquire the necessary territory by war. Christian morality is personal and social, and in its nature cannot be political."*

The idea brought out here is that Christianity is all right for the individual. "Its object is to promote morality of the individual, in order to strengthen him to work unselfishly in the interests of the community." Christianity can have, according to this, no political reference. It fails utterly when the State tries to use it. When the State makes a demand, Christ is not conceived to be equal to the occasion. To carry out its ideals the State is thoroughly justified in covering the world with the blood of innocent women and children. The drowning of one hundred and fifty babies in the sinking of the *Lusitania* is only an incident; only a mere item in the sacrifices required by the State in carrying out its policy. If any vital "differences develop between the nations" then "every arbitration treaty will burn like tinder and end in smoke,"† and again, "the abolition of war . . . *is absolutely immoral* and must be stigmatized as unworthy of the human race."

*"Germany and the Next War," page 22. Friedrich von Bernhardi.

†*Ibid.*, page 32. Bernhardi.

On this basis there is no hope of peace for the world in the present or future, and in fact, peace should not be sought, for it would mean the "abolition of war," and this is "absolutely immoral." War, says Treitschke, is merely a kind of "drastic medicine for the human race," and again, "among all political sins, the sin of feebleness is the most contemptible; it is the political sin against the Holy Ghost."* When the sin of feebleness, as, for instance, in the case of Belgium, is committed, the punishment must be drastic. It must be war, ceaseless war, and the feeble one must either be strengthened or stamped out of existence.

This is what happens in brute nature. It is the survival of the physically fittest and it accepts the method of physical nature as the highest example for the moral world, notwithstanding Huxley's dictum that the ethical process opposes the cosmic process at every step. Thus the eyes of the great German politicians and historians are turned backwards and downwards instead of upwards. Germany must prevail. "Germans aim at nothing less than the domination of Europe." Again, it is "the determination of Germany to make its strength and capabilities prevail

*"Politik," Vol. I, page 76. Treitschke.

in the world."* The presence of difficulties in the way of regarding the rights of others is not considered. Germany *must* prevail. *Falabas* and *Lusitanias* may go down, Belgium may be torn to shreds, hundreds of thousands of Belgian women may have their husbands executed before their eyes—dragged out of bed and shot like dogs because some passing patrols of irregulars had fired into a town at night—but Germany *must* prevail. Every international law may be broken, Canadian, English and French soldiers may die in hundreds from the effects of asphyxiating gases, prohibited in war by all civilized nations, beautiful cathedrals may be destroyed and much of France turned into a desert, but Germany *must* prevail.

It was the same in the German sack of Rome a few hundred years ago. The military categorical imperative, with no reason as its ground save conquest for the rulers and the military caste, exercised its tyranny until in the matter of barbarism the conquerors went one better than any tribe of warlike people before them. All throughout history there is noticeable every now and then among the Germanic peoples a hostile military movement resulting in a baptism of blood throughout

*Speech of German Imperial Chancellor in Reichstag. November 12th, 1912.

half the world. It is nothing new to notice the rising of a war epidemic in Germany, and England should have read history well enough to know that another outburst was inevitable. Only a few men such as Lord Roberts and Lord Kitchener saw deeply into the heart of Germany and heard the rumbling of the mighty eruption. But their warning fell upon deaf ears and the peaceful British continued to carry on the work of "shop-keeping."

Whence came this categorical imperative? Not from the Germany of the poets, metaphysicians, scientists and moralists. It rose from the slumbering brute in Germany and from no other source. It is well enough to say that when a nation is thoroughly convinced that she is right and divinely set apart to lead the world, she would be recreant to her duty if she did not struggle with all her might to propagate her ideals and civilization. But it should be noticed that this way of looking at things has drenched the world in blood on more than one occasion. Consider what happened to the Waldenses in 1485 under the pressure of a dogmatism very much like that now paraded in Germany:—

"There is not a town in Piedmont," says a Vaudois writer, "where some of our brethren have not been put to death. Jordan Terbano was burnt alive at Susa; Hippolite

Rossiero at Turin; Michael Goneto, an octogenarian, at Sarcena; Hugo Chiambs, of Fenestrelle, had his entrails torn from his living body at Turin; Peter Geymarali of Bobbio in like manner had his entrails taken out in Lucerna, and a fierce cat thrust in their place to torture him further; Maria Romano was buried alive at Rocca Patia; Magdalen Fanno underwent the same fate at San Giovanni; Susanna Michelini was bound hand and foot, and left to perish of cold and hunger on the snow at Sarcena; Bartolomeo Fache, gashed with sabres, had the wounds filled with quicklime, and perished thus in agony at Fenile; Daniel Michelini had his tongue torn out at Bobbo for having praised God; James Baridari perished covered with sulphurous matches which had been forced into his flesh under his nails, between his fingers, in the nostrils, in the lips, and all over his body, and then lighted; Daniel Rovelli had his mouth filled with gunpowder, which, being lighted, blew his head to pieces; Anna Charbonnier was impaled, and carried thus on a pike from San Giovanni to La Torre."*

Does not this sound very much like an account of the deeds of the German soldiers in Belgium acting under a similar impulse

*Quoted from "Will to Believe," page 48. William James.

fortified with the notion that they were right and all others were wrong? But can we trust the reports? Professor Münsterberg says that we cannot, and he is an honourable man; so are all the German professors, "all honourable men." But honourable men are often blinded by prejudice, and the old saying is true that "blood is thicker than water." But can we trust these reports, we ask again? What says Münsterberg? "The facts become modified and remoulded by those who observe and report them. I have no doubt the unintentional distortion may at any time reshape the facts until no one can recognize the truth in the twisted stories . . . All who report stand under autosuggestive influence which makes them fully believe what they write down, and these illusory elements may turn some most harmless occurrence into the wildest absurdity."* This autosuggestive influence at present only applies to English and American stories concerning the war. The stories in and from Berlin are as true as possible under the circumstances. But no doubt "German and Austrian imagination would run wild" under certain crushing conditions like those under which the Allies are struggling at the present time. But Germany is so

*"The Peace and America," pages 25, 26. Münsterberg.

successful in her wholesale murder policy that there is no need of distorting the facts. Germans would hardly stoop to twist facts. That would be a sin against the Holy Ghost.

Without trusting to hearsay, let us turn to the most reliable reports that can be procured. Viscount Bryce, former British Ambassador at Washington and a historian of note, had associated with him on a committee of investigation such men as Sir Frederick Pollock, Sir Edward Clarke, Sir Alfred Hopkinson, H. A. L. Fisher, Vice-Chancellor of the University of Sheffield, Harold Cox and Kenelm E. Digby. The report submitted reveals the fact that murder, lust and pillage prevailed over many parts of Belgium on a scale unparalleled in history in any war between civilized nations. Let us see how a few of these facts appear in print:—

In Soumagne and Micheroux very many civilians were summarily shot. Fifty-six men were murdered in a field. A villager asked to be allowed to speak. The answer was three volleys and instant death. At Heure le Romain all the male inhabitants, including bedridden men, were imprisoned in a church. The torch was applied everywhere. On the night of the 20th a terrible massacre took place in the streets of Liège. The *Rue des Pitteurs* and houses in the *Place de l'Univer-*

sité and the *Quai des Percheurs* were systematically fired with benzine. Inhabitants were prevented from escaping by rifle fire. At Andeune four hundred people were massacred. One man, placed close to a machine gun, had his "insides" blown out. A hair-dresser was murdered in his kitchen. A paralytic was put to death in his garden. Prisoners were used as a shelter for a pontoon bridge. At Dinant about ninety bodies of unarmed civilians were found in a square and sixty were recovered from a hole in a brewery yard, while forty-eight bodies of women and children were found in a garden. In Malines a witness swore that he saw a German soldier cut a woman's breast after he had murdered her. Many bodies of women were found in the street. Two young women were lying in the back yard of a house. One had her breasts cut off, the other had been stabbed. In Sempst the corpse of a man with his legs cut off was discovered. At Elewyt a man's naked body was tied up to a ring in the wall in the back-yard of a house. The corpse was horribly mutilated. A woman's naked body was found in the same back yard. At Haecht a child of three, with its stomach cut open by a bayonet, was lying near a house. In the same town a child of two or three years old was found nailed to the door of a farmhouse by its

hands and feet. At Eppeghem the body of a child was found pinned to the ground with a German lance. At Louvain, massacre, fire and destruction went on from morning to night. Crowds of people were brought from Aershot and Gelrod and put to death. At Malines a baby was cruelly murdered by a drunken soldier. On one occasion children were roped together and used as a military screen against the enemy. Again, three soldiers went into action, carrying small children, to protect themselves from flank fire. At Tamines three small children were slaughtered on the green for no apparent motive. Space is not sufficient for the account of others butchered at Hofstade, Sempst, Haecht, Rotselaer, Westpelaer and many other places.

A few others from miscellaneous accounts may be mentioned:—Walter Shaw, fifth engineer of the Elder-Dempster steamship *Egorie,* a member of the crew of the ill-fated steamer *Falaba,* reported:—"Only five minutes were allowed for the departure of all passengers from the ship before the torpedo from a German submarine struck her. A group of twelve Germans in uniform watched the *Falaba* sinking, and enjoyed the spectacle of men and women struggling in a rough sea. Passengers clutched at the plates of the ship, vainly trying to dig their fingers firmly against the

lapping; but the sea was rough and they were soon swept away. In those eyes that glared at us from the upturned faces there was a call, unspoken, that sounded more clearly than a siren's shriek—and so they drifted slowly away."

From an American woman in the western war zone we have the following:—"In north France there are scores of Belgian widows whose husbands had been executed before their eyes, dragged out of bed and shot like dogs." "There were also the mangled bodies of women and children in a score of open unfortified towns near Calais, visited by German airships, though they were not even military bases."

From the report of Sir John French in respect to the first day's fighting north of Ypres we reap these facts:—"The enemy made use of a large number of appliances for the production of asphyxiating gas. The quantity produced indicates long and deliberate preparation." Again: "A German officer was discovered by three men lying wounded in Lys. One of the three went back and told the sergeant, who came along with a young subaltern to help the officer to the ambulance. As they bent over the wounded man, he whipped out a revolver and shot both in the head." "A doctor saw a Belgian priest crucified on

his church door and left to die." "A farm house was held by ten Germans or so. On the advance of the Lincolns the Germans sent out a man with a white flag. Directly the party sent to receive prisoners surrendering got within range they were all shot down." Captain R. A. S. Allen, 5th Canadian Battalion, said with his dying breath to C. J. C. Clayton, a New Zealander: "Tell the world, especially in Canada, where my wife lives, that I was not killed, but murdered. I was taken a prisoner by the Germans. The enemy being hustled, dropped me and deliberately shot me in the stomach." Again we have from the same dying witness in reference to another: "A sergeant was tied up by the arms and legs to a tree and pierced sixty times by German bayonets."

All the psychology of autosuggestion in the world cannot rub the main facts recorded here from the pages of history, although some of the fringes may have to go. The great facts stand out, notwithstanding Münsterberg's elaborate apology designed for the pacification of the American people, having in view the approaching German crisis. Leaving out details that tend to be changed in the psychological crucible let us sum up the bare facts that few can doubt: Belgium is devastated and trodden underfoot. There are indisput-

able evidences that in many parts of Belgium deliberate and systematically organized massacres of the civil population have taken place. These have been accompanied by many isolated murders and other outrages. Innocent civilians have been murdered in large numbers. Looting, house-burning, wanton destruction of property were ordered and countenanced by the officers of the German army. In general the rules and usages of war have all been broken, and particularly by the use of women and children as shields for advancing forces exposed to fire. The *Falaba* and *Lusitania* are at the bottom of the sea and hundreds of innocent lives, including those of women and children, have been taken. Hospital ships have been torpedoed. Mines have been scattered indiscriminately on the high seas and trade routes. The American steamer *Gulflight* was destroyed by a German torpedo May 1st off the Scilly Islands while she was flying a large American ensign, six or ten feet in size. Last but not least, indicating unfathomed degradation, the report comes from Berlin as follows:—"Hundreds of telegrams of congratulation are being sent to Admiral von Tirpitz, the German Minister of Marine, on the sinking of the *Lusitania*. The *Lokal Anzieger* contributed the thought that the "destruction of the *Lusitania* was com-

pletely justified according to the laws of warfare." Again, "The fact that it was we Germans who destroyed the ships must make us proud of ourselves. The *Lusitania* case will attain for us more respect than a hundred battles won on land." The climax is reached in the German paper *Der Tag* in the following words referring to the *Lusitania:*

> "The ship goes down, with passengers and crew,
> Hurrah! a thousand German lives it will save;
> To guard one steeled gray hero we would strew
> Ten *Lusitanias* gladly 'neath the wave."

The main facts in the above have not been disputed by friend or enemy. They are not "so-called facts," but actual facts of recent history. However Kultur may be defined and whatever numeral may be attached to it, the moral law implies that somehow and under some circumstances the tree is known by its fruit, and there is a meaning in this not yet fully appreciated by the apostle of "Eternal Values" and author of "The Peace and America."

In general, a nation's "science, art, literature, morality and religion" as "contrasted with mere technical civilization" represent her Kultur and give a true expression of her soul, but there is no military categorical imperative written upon these. The latter is an

excrescence, an unnatural growth, and must be treated as such. This is the only justification the civilized world, apart from Germany, can discover for her recent methods of warfare. When once this malignant growth is removed or reduced the world may again expect peace, but not until then. With the under-soul constantly asserting itself, the rest of the world would have work cut out for many years to successfully hold it in check. But it must be reduced, cost what it may, not only for the sake of the world's peace but for the political health of Germany herself.

No apologist of German "frightfulness" can hope to make her look better in the eyes of the world while she continues to carry on her wicked business of sinking neutral ships and murdering innocent people. She must repudiate her medicine-men, that is, her militarists, and then she will gradually recover from her mania for war.

So far she has been hypnotized by the activities of a few powerful politicians, philosophers and historians, such as Treitschke, Nietzsche and Bernhardi, and her lower sensuous nature, always longing for conquest, has yielded to the ideas of these men, and, having put her hand to the plow, she is too proud to look back.

German literature, science, art and ethical theories will always be appreciated and the cultivated world will be eternally grateful for the mental stimulus that has come from the German literary atmosphere. Professor Cramb in his book, "Germany and England," has portrayed in glowing words the debt that England and America owe to Germany. "Germany has one of the greatest and most profound schools of poetry—yet how many Englishmen have the secret of its high places or access to its templed wonders? Since the decline of Alexandria there has been no such group of daring thinkers as those of Germany in the later eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries; yet to most English men and women the 'Critique of Pure Reason' and the larger version of Hegel's 'Logic' are sealed as the 'Enneads' of Plotinus. Merely as an unexampled opportunity for the study of the soul of a people why should England neglect this literature?"*

"German scholarship has not left a single period in its annals unillumined by some work which is marked by distinction or power and yet remains untranslated into English."† All this is true, and not by any means to the

*"Germany and England," page 5. J. A. Cramb.

†*Ibid.*, page 7.

credit of English scholarship. But after all sometimes ignorance is bliss, especially when the knowledge to be gained is touched with a latent fire that may prove detrimental to the peace and well-being of the race. German literature in general is daring and provocative of thought, and her political literary productions display an intense love of country and a deep faith in German destiny, but the non-German scholar looks in vain for the touch of that broader human sympathy that is evident in the literature of other peoples. He searches without success for that touch of human kindness that reaches beyond the confines of the German Empire. The head has taken the place of the heart and cold logic has supplanted the finer human feelings.

The fourth conception of Kultur represents it "in contrast to all human products which are created for purely selfish and personal reasons and embraces everything which has been guided by the organized nation with its community will."* Here Kultur is contrasted with utilitarianism and individualism. These attitudes of mind, of course, mark the English and American people; and a German in the light of the above definition "would be consistent if he said that such nations had no

*"The Peace and America," page 133. Münsterberg.

Kultur." It would be only natural for such an one to "claim that this German idea of the State is more efficient for the total progress of mankind than any other type." Then as soon as he gets this into his head he only needs a little inspiration and some leadership and at once he becomes a Machiavellian in his heart. Utilitarianism says: Seek the greatest happiness for the greatest number, and "whatever is desired otherwise than as a means to some end beyond itself, and ultimately to happiness, is desired as itself a part of happiness, and is not desired for itself until it has become so. Those who desire virtue for its own sake, desire it either because the consciousness of it is a pleasure, or because the consciousness of being without it is a pain, or for both reasons united."* German "idealism" says: Seek that which furthers and inspires the inner life, and above all seek to be an efficient item in a cultured State.

Certainly it is highly desirable to seek that which builds up the inner life and to sacrifice oneself for the State, but when this stern devotion, because of its very intensity, overtops proper bounds and becomes, when intellectually expressed, a bare tenacious dogmatism pledged to impose itself upon others,

*"Utilitarianism," page 86. Mill.

it becomes a veritable menace. The State exists, according to this conception, not merely for the purpose of preserving individuals and ensuring their happiness; it exists to body forth a law or ideal. Each individual must look beyond himself and serve the ideal as embodied in the State, and this ideal must be obeyed by each individual irrespective of circumstances. No man is living for himself or for the happiness of others. It is a case of loyalty to loyalty. No "efficiency" for bare selfish ends is allowed, but all "efficiency" must be for the sake of "ideal purposes." It is a loyalty to "eternal values" or a loyalty to "cultural purposes." German Kultur, says Professor Münsterberg, "is a striving for ennoblement, for humanity, for godliness in history." Each individual consciously submits himself to duty as he conceives it. His thought, if he is true at heart, is not of himself, but of the law, the ideal. He freely consents to respect the ideal.

Although this is admirable morality so long as it keeps within bounds and does not link itself to the military spirit, yet at the same time it has the weakness, at least for the English mind, of being too formal. Be true to the ideal of ennoblement, it says. Yes, but must not this be finally for the sake of the happiness of humanity? And what infallible

voice is there to tell me when an act is noble, if I am considering barely the eternal value of the law?

The criticism that Jacobi made concerning the stern categorical imperative of Kant seems to apply very well in this case. In a letter to Fichte he says:—

"Yes, I am the Atheist, the godless one, who in spite of the will that wills nothing, am ready to lie as the dying Desdemona lied; to lie and deceive like Pylades, when he pretended to be Orestes; to murder like Timoleon; to break law and oath like Epaminondas, like John De Witt; to commit suicide with Otho, and sacrilege with David,—yea, to rub the ears of corn on the Sabbath day, merely because I am hungry, and because *the law is made for the sake of man and not man for the sake of the law.* I am that godless one, and I deride the philosophy that calls me godless for such reasons, both it and its Supreme Being; for with the holiest certitude which I have in me, I know that the prerogative of pardon (*privilegium aggratiandi*) in reference to such transgressions of the letter of the absolute law of reason, is the characteristic royal right of man, the seal of his dignity and of his divine nature." No man should, thus, act "in blind obedience to the law" (*blindgesetzlich*) irrespective of circumstances.

The German Army is said to embody the "moral will" of Germany and is an expression of its Kultur. If this be the case the national will is nothing short of frightful. Can it be true that the national will on its own initiative is now expressing itself in the fearful crimes perpetrated in Belgium and upon the high seas? Certainly we know that the policy of "frightfulness" is only carried out to gain the end sought. But does the end justify the breaking of all international agreements and a method of brigandage never equalled in the history of civilized warfare? If the "moral national" soul of Germany is now expressing itself and is content to continue to express itself as it has been in Belgium, so much the worse for that national soul. It is doomed to perish with the sword that it has taken.

But, says the great apologist, it is wrong to say that Germany is seeking empire or world dominion. She does not want more territory but only to cause her ideals to prevail. If she wants no more territory why treat Belgium already as if she were a part of Germany and why have the Germans posted placards in Belgian conquered territory stating that it is already a German province? If she wants no more territory why so many pronouncements expressing the very opposite by great German

politicians? The recent speech of Counsellor Passache, Liberal leader and Vice-President of the Reichstag, is a case in point. He says:

"The pen of the diplomat must not spoil what the sword has so well achieved. The land which we have conquered at the cost of so much German blood, our bravest and our best, must never be returned. We must (even) not stop where we are, but we must progress to the English Channel and capture all of the British strongholds as an earnest plea for a permanent peace. The sword has well achieved its mission. Diplomacy must not spoil it."

Again, German newspapers have very recently been recklessly regaling their readers with Bismarckian pabulum. Bright and martial sayings of the Iron Chancellor have appeared on many of their pages and nearly all of them have been calculated to stimulate the pride of the German people in their military position and power. Thus Bismarck is quoted as saying:

"The German nation as a military union is the greatest power in the world, and has nothing to fear. With iron tread, we shall crush all that is opposed to or hinders the German nation, and its glory and power. We sing '*Fest steht und treu die Wacht am Rhein*,' but the Watch on the Warthe and Vistula is

just as strong. Neither on the one side nor on the other can we allow the loss of a single acre."

"The highest ideals of righteousness and honour control Germany's national will toward other nations. She does not desire the subjection of any non-German people." Her great aim is to be loyal to the ideals of her Kultur, and "Kultur is the systematized furtherance of the aims of the national soul." So asserts the second seer of Königsberg. Can anyone read the history of the causes of this war and of the conduct of it and yet believe the first statement of this paragraph? High ideals of righteousness and butchery of women and children on a scale never before dreamed of by civilized people may be put together by the German mind, which abounds in new methods of logic, but they cannot be reconciled in English and French minds, perhaps because the latter are not proficient in the newer tricks of logic. The soul of Germany longs "for eternal peace," but it must be a peace with Germany in control of the world and ruling all nations with the "mailed fist." Then under his own vine and fig-tree, which would be exceptionally large, the Teuton would sing without fear of interruption the "beloved song"—*Deutschland über Alles.*

CHAPTER IV.

CANADA, NEWFOUNDLAND AND IRELAND.

Those who know the history of Canada know also that all her instincts, all her purposes and all her desires are for peace. The struggles of her early days have been forgotten and a few months ago she would have thought it a fairy tale or the imaginative ravings of a half-witted visionary if she had been told that within twelve months she would have one hundred thousand soldiers ready to send to the front to meet a barbarous enemy. But the soldiers have been recruited and trained and two contingents have gone and another is about to go to fight for British ideals and the integrity of the British Empire.

At a special session of the Canadian Parliament, August 30th, 1914, Sir Wilfrid Laurier, speaking on the war, made use of the following inspired words:—

"It is our duty, more pressing upon us than all other duty, at once on this first day of the Canadian Parliament, to let Great Britain know, to let the friends and foes of Great Britain know, that there is in Canada

one mind and one heart, and that all Canadians stand behind the Mother Country, conscious and proud that she did not engage in this war from any selfish motive, for any purpose of aggrandizement, but that she engaged in this war to maintain untarnished the honour of her name, to fulfil her obligations to her allies, to maintain her treaty obligations, and to save civilization from the unbridled lust of conquest and power."

Sir Robert Borden, who followed him, said:

"As to our duty we all are agreed. We stand shoulder to shoulder with Britain and the other British Dominions in this quarrel. And that duty we shall not fail to fulfil as the honour of Canada demands—not for love of battle, not for love of conquest, not for greed of possession, but for the cause of honour, to maintain solemn pledges, to uphold principles of liberty, to withstand forces that would convert the world into an armed camp. We have entered into this war, and while gravely conscious of the tremendous issues involved, and of all the sacrifices that they may entail, we do not shrink from them, but with firm hearts we abide the event."

These burning words soon found their way to every part of the Dominion and also to the British Isles. Twenty thousand men were at once offered to the British Government and

promptly accepted. Then came the rush of men to the armouries to offer themselves for the Motherland, and stirring scenes were witnessed on every side, as money and material were offered in large quantities to aid in the struggle.

It did not take Major A. Hamilton Gault very long to offer to raise and equip a complete regiment. The offer was accepted, and before long a splendid body of men called the Princess Patricia's Canadian Light Infantry, named in honour of the Governor-General's daughter, was ready to bear the standard worked by the Princess herself against the barbarous Teutons.

Two submarines were purchased, a million bags of flour were sent to the Old Country, a censorship was instituted and the Government offered to equip a Canadian hospital in France. Magnificent offers came from all the Canadian provinces and cities, offers of men and money to help in the battle against the enemies of Britain.

Then came the announcement that 22,500 men would be sent from Canada, but the rush to enlist was so great that soon 31,000 men were on the lists. A training-camp, covering about sixteen square miles, and known as Valcartier, was created near Quebec, and in a very short time, under the efficient hand of

Colonel Victor Williams the men were equipped, drilled and sent to England. The first contingent numbered in all 31,082 men that went overseas and later there were added as reinforcements 5,113. All honour to the name of the Minister of Militia, Major-General the Hon. Sir Sam Hughes, who, with a gallant staff of helpers, carried forward the work of mobilization with such a firm and unerring hand.

After the six weeks' training at Valcartier the whole of the First Contingent was transported with the utmost secrecy across the ocean to historic Plymouth. On a red-letter day in the first week in October a wonderful armada started from the beautiful Gaspe Bay and after a successful voyage across the Atlantic reached the above-named place. Then came the long weeks of training amid the mud of Salisbury Plain. But with visions of trenches and fleeing Germans in mind, they laboured on until on February 9th they found themselves at last in long-wished-for France and a few days later facing the most cruel and persistent foe that the world has ever known.

As soon as the first contingent had gone another was projected. As winter weather rendered Valcartier unfit for further drilling of soldiers, schools and public buildings were used to answer the purpose of barracks, and

the work of recruiting and training proceeded. The Second Contingent, consisting of about 30,000 men under the command of General Steele and 6,453 officers and men as reinforcements drawn from all parts of the Dominion, have also gone forward and have given a good account of themselves on the fighting line.

As soon as the Second Contingent went forward successful efforts were begun to form a third. Several of the regiments are training at this time at Valcartier.

Canada will not stop recruiting until the war is brought to a successful issue. She will keep on recruiting and training while ever a dollar is left in the country. She will keep on until her last man is gone and her last hope crushed if this be necessary. But we know that it will not be necessary, for the cause of right will certainly prevail within a reasonable time.

The forces mentioned are by no means the whole of the efficient military strength of Canada. There are eleven thousand troops on guard duty at canals, granaries, etc. There are also Canadian soldiers at Bermuda and St. Lucia, making a grand total, so far, of 150,000 men.

The war, which is costing the Dominion Government nearly $150,000,000 a year, has only so far touched the periphery of Canadian

resources. When ideals are at stake the Canadian people are as earnest as any in the struggle to preserve their integrity. When liberty and justice are attacked Canada will always fight with the nation on the side of these ideals, and if it comes to the worst she will gather and expend five hundred million dollars a year to aid in bringing the war to a successful issue.

Now, the number of soldiers furnished by this country may appear small, but it must not be forgotten that it is four times larger than the number of British troops under Wellington at Waterloo. Numbers do not always count. "Thrice is he armed that hath his quarrel just." Bernhardi's remark in reference to numbers in battle is applicable here:—"History teaches us by countless examples that numbers in themselves have only been the decisive factors in war when the opponents have been equally matched otherwise, or when the superiority of the one party exceeds the proportion required by the numerical law."*

They have gone from all parts of the British Empire to fight for the Motherland. The Sikhs and Ghurkas have fought for France as the ally of Great Britain, Australians and

*"Vom heutigen Kriege," Vol. I, Chap. ii. Bernhardi.

New Zealanders have crossed the southern seas to defend Egypt from the German-led Turk, the Dutch and British have fought side by side under the leadership of General Botha to preserve the solidarity of South Africa as a part of the British Empire, and the Canadians have taken their large part in the struggle for freedom and for the integrity of that Empire whose flag has braved a thousand years the battle and the breeze.

No one will say that Canada rushed into the war to hold up the hands of the Motherland in her lust for conquest. As a matter of fact, in the last hundred years England has only been engaged in one important war, namely, the Crimean, waged about sixty years ago. No wars of aggression have been carried on since that time. The other minor wars have been wars of liberation and protection. England has never been a war-seeking or a territory-seeking Empire, notwithstanding German statements to the contrary.

Canada would never have entered this war if she had not been convinced in every drop of her blood that the Motherland was right when she flung herself in the path of oppressed Belgium and reached out her arm to ward off the crushing of France. Her pacific attitude was plain enough to all save her avowed enemies. Her efforts in this direction were

perfectly obvious for many years to those who had eyes to see. In 1889 she made repeated attempts to bring about an understanding with Germany so as to preserve good-will and amity between the two nations. She even went so far as to give up Heligoland to the German Empire for certain worthless territories. This same Heligoland to-day, an island very close to German territory, is a standing menace to the British navy and British arms in general. Thus twenty-five years ago Germany was strengthening a plan, hatched twenty or thirty years before that, to attack British interests when the time was ripe.

Since the time of the giving over of this island repeated efforts have been made by England to ensure peace for the world. In 1898 the Czar's proposal for the reduction of war armaments, favoured strongly by Britain, was refused by Germany. Once more, in 1906, a proposition towards the same end came from the Russian Emperor. It was once more promptly refused by Germany. In 1904 French outstanding difficulties were cleared up, and in 1907 the way was made smooth for a lasting Russian friendship and troubles in Tibet, Persia and Afghanistan were amicably settled. England has been the peacemaker ever since. Even after the outbreak of the present war, as we have already seen, England

struggled up to the very last through her Foreign Secretary, Sir Edward Grey, to preserve the peace of the world and restrain the great scourge of Europe from breaking loose.

It was clear, then, from the very first that Germany wanted war. Upon the assassination of the Austrian Archduke in Bosnia, an Austrian ultimatum so unexampled in its severity that it meant the denationalization of Serbia was forwarded to the latter country. It called for an answer within forty-eight hours. Britain at once interceded by requesting Germany to influence Austria in reference to the time limit and by asking Russia to strive to moderate the reply of Serbia. Germany refused to move a hand to influence Austria. Britain saw the danger of the situation and immediately requested Russia and Serbia to see to it that the demands put forth in the ultimatum should be met as far as possible. All civilized nations outside of Austria and Germany strove to ward off the blow and hinder the deluge of blood that would flow throughout Europe. All was of no use. Germany would not move an inch. She as much as said: "Let it come. We are prepared and have been for the last forty years. The devil take the hindermost." In a short time the battle was on.

Canada, with her eye upon the course of events, saw as it were from afar the herculean efforts of the Motherland and her Allies to preserve the peace of the world. She saw also the arrogant military spirit of Germany seeking in Bernhardi's words, "Empire or Downfall, (*Weltmacht oder Niedergang*)" and at once her mind was made up. She would rally to the standard of the Mother Country. She would help to the best of her ability to lay the "proud usurper low." Since the time of that decision all Canada has been an armed camp and not a whisper of criticism of British policy, in the prosecution of her part in the war, has been heard. Canada is a solid unit with the Motherland in this terrible struggle. In fact, there has never been such unanimity of spirit and purpose and endeavour as now prevails in all parts of the British Dominions. The cry that rings from the Atlantic to the Pacific is: "German militarism must be destroyed!" And Canada is willing to back up this resolve with the last cent of her money, the last ounce of her strength and the last drop of her blood.

The German conception of a weakened and brutalized England, rendered unstable by an "ever-increasing alien element" and sinking into a "subject province though nominally free," with the colonies, Canada, South Africa,

Australia, Newfoundland and New Zealand, shaking off the uneasy yoke of the Motherland, has been effectually contradicted by the marvellous loyalty displayed by all the colonies. The idea of the disloyalty of India buttressed by the effusions of Mommsen and Curtius and the robust phrases of Dahn and Nietzsche also led her to think that when the opportune moment came India would, after a century and a half of British rule, break away from her thoughtful studies and claim the right of governing herself. Egypt, too, according to German ideas, was ready to throw off the yoke of a "timorous, craven nation trusting to its fleet," while Canada, away across the sea and in close proximity with the United States, had become impregnated with the spirit expressed in the Declaration of Independence. Doubtless this dream has faded from the German mind after twelve months of war, especially as all parts of the British Empire are working together like the parts of a machine.

One would imagine on reading Treitschke, Häusser, Droysen, Schlosser and other Prussian historians, that nearly all the notable battles won by Britain were won by the help of German arms. "From Blenheim to La Belle Alliance, German valour was prodigal of German blood in winning your victories. Gibraltar itself was captured for you by a foreign

force led by a German prince. The advance of Blücher and his corps of Prussians saved your army from annihilation." How very kind and considerate of Prussia to help England to win nearly all her wars and to place over against her in these modern days the stimulating example of the military activities of a nation of warriors. I am sure she will never forget Germany, and especially the mighty belligerent writer of the Hohenzollern dynasty, Heinrich von Treitschke.

Again, if you put away your Treitschke and take up once more your less-cultured but equally belligerent Bernhardi, you will find much in the same strain. But what he says concerning the colonies interests us most just here. It is as follows: "With regard to those colonies which employ self-government, and are therefore more or less free republics, as Canada, Australia, South Africa, it is very questionable whether they will permanently retain any traces of the English spirit. It seems uncertain at the present time whether England will be able to include them permanently in the Empire."*

Is not the British spirit burning in the Canadian bosom to-day stronger than ever before? Does it look as if England had any trouble

*"Germany and the Next War," page 80. Bernhardi.

in retaining Canada within her Empire? That Canadian is yet to be found who wishes to tear himself away from the easy yoke of the Motherland. No! Canada is ready with her sons and her money, ready with her energy and her enterprise to worship at the common altar of Justice and Liberty as they are interpreted by the great statesmen of the Empire. This does not mean that she submits without thought to English ideas concerning the righteousness of this war. It means that she has thought it all out herself and offered her aid voluntarily after mature deliberation.

Germany may boast of her great heroes and her great soldiers, but her record has never had the lustre of that of Britain, and Teutonic soldiers to-day cannot exceed in bravery those from peaceful Canada, although previously untrained in the arts of war. The opinions of General von Bernhardi in reference to the worthlessness of our mercenary army have shown themselves to be without foundation.

The great battle of Ypres and the heroic stand of the Canadian soldiers there will go down to history as the greatest and bravest deed that ever men were called upon to accomplish. We understand that in this battle 8,000 Canadians held back 64,000 Germans with a determination and valour worthy of the followers of Leonidas at the narrow pass

of Thermopylae. This fight will never fade from the minds of colonials, because sufficient colonial blood was shed here to cement Canada and Newfoundland to the British Empire as never before in an indissoluble union.

The Germans had massed a great body of soldiers with the determination to break through to the coast at all costs. On they came, with all the devilish devices that scientific minds could devise for blood-letting and death. Poisonous gases were let loose by the Germans upon the devoted Allies in such quantities that the ground for a wide area had turned a deep yellow, as if covered with powder. The light from the German star shells lit up the battle-field as well as if a thousand incandescent lights were in place upon the field. The beating of the bullets resembled hail driven by a strong wind through a forest, while the bursting of shells was like the sound of the pounding of mighty drums by the superhuman arms of all the gods, led on by the warlike Mars. Germany was making her supreme effort to reach Calais, and the only obstacle in the way of complete success was a small body of untried but brave Canadians.

At four o'clock in the afternoon the alarm became general that the Germans had broken through the French line, and immediately the Canadians were ordered to hinder if possible

the enemy's advance. The advance was made by rushes over an open field. Bullets were flying everywhere. At first the Canadians thought that there were two lines of trenches between them and the Germans, but in a twinkling they discovered that they were the first line and the Huns were advancing in massed formation right in front. No time for the gathering of food or other supplies. The command was given to advance, and the sons of Canadian soil together with those of Terra Nova never hesitated, although they knew that it spelled death, but under the strains of "O Canada!" moved forward. Then the order was given to halt, and the work of "digging in" began in earnest. This work was done with feverish haste, for every moment while exposed, Canadian soldiers were laid low as the German bullets mowed them down like grass in a harvest field.

The strain was terrible, and it looked as if they also would have to give up. Suddenly a voice rang out over the noise of the battle-field: "Canadians, this line must not retire!" It seemed almost an impossibility. It demanded the superhuman. It called for the miraculous. It was the command of one born on Canadian soil and who knew no fear. The soldiers looked at one another with quick, desperate glances, as they dug for themselves

places of temporary safety. But was it not all in vain? A thin line of khaki against masses of Germans—one to eight and the artillery of hell playing around them. They could scarcely believe their ears until the command rang out once more: "Canadians, this line must not retire!" And they did not retire, but held their position, keeping back the main tide of the deadly German aggregation all through that fearful night.

At eight o'clock an English regiment came up from the rear. On they came, exposed to the rain of death. One moment they were flat on their faces, another rushing forward with all their might. Many never rose from the mother earth to reach the Canadian trenches, but the brave English showed no signs of fear but pressed forward to hearten the exhausted Canadians and help check the desperate drive of the enemy. It was a glorious struggle and has covered Canada with undying glory.

The mighty impetus of the Teutonic drive had carried the enemy across the Yser Canal. Frenchmen as brave as the Invincible Guard of Napoleon at Waterloo had given way before that mighty charge. The village of Lizerne, on the west bank, was immediately stormed by the invaders. The Canadians, however, were fighting the battle of their lives, and by their devoted efforts hindered the re-

serves of the German army from pouring in through the gap. Facing north along the fringe of the German line of advance, they continued such a desperate resistance that a part of the Teutonic army was diverted from crossing the Yser.

In this great struggle General Alderson and Brigadier Burstall performed almost superhuman tasks. Along the line they everywhere cheered the soldiers. The ammunition columns were no less heroic than the others. All were struggling amid the deadly gas of the German shells. The 16th Battalion fought as only heroes can. Canada was at the front now. Here were men from Montreal, St. John, Ottawa, Toronto, Calgary, Vancouver, and Newfoundland—all fighting side by side for liberty, England and home, everyone willing to lay down his life for the cause. The fierce Teutons appeared with nose-protectors and spray apparatus on their backs, and all the machinery necessary for dealing death to the enemy. The advancing hosts could first only be dimly seen because of the yellow gas from the bombs. Colonel McHarg, of Vancouver, was killed while attempting to rescue a private from the mouth of a machine gun. Colonel Birchell, wounded twice, kept his feet and fought as only a hero can until mortally wounded. The French, not far away, strug-

gled heroically, but the vastly superior numbers of advancing Germans compelled them to retire. Three times the Canadians surged against the German lines and finally regained possession of the four guns that they in their hasty retreat had left behind.

The world will never forget that it was the colonials who saved the British lines at Ypres. It was the colonials that threw back the great Niagara of advancing barbarians. It was colonial regiments, composed of civilians, who had only a few months training, drawn from the ordinary employments of peace, that faced the flower of the German army and hindered their advance to Calais.

By battalions they fell in the unequal struggle, but their blood has cemented the Empire as nothing else could. And the very fact that they were present at the crucial moment to successfully aid the picked soldiers of France and the heroic infantry of the British Isles is a thing that history can never overlook. It means that no longer will the Mother Country stand alone in any future contest. No longer will Downing Street alone make war and decide peace. Henceforward the Colonies will take part in every worthy British cause, for they have amply proved their ability to do so.

A St. John officer, who was through all of the heavy fighting at Langemarck and St. Julien, sent home the following letter describing, in lurid words, the great battle in which a handful of men with four guns stemmed the drive of probably sixty-four thousand soldiers with seventy-five guns. This is part of the letter:

"The Germans kindly bayoneted our wounded during the battle, and they crucified a wounded sergeant of Highlanders on a gate of St. Julien. They are swine. A little bugler of ours was ordered to surrender to them by a captain of one company that was cut off and intended to fight it out, and when he went up unarmed, with his hands up, the brutes ran him through with their bayonets. Two of our companies were surrounded at St. Julien and repulsed six attacks and the seventh went over them.

"That was the first big battle we have been in, and I should not mind if it were the last. It was simply awful. Our total dead, British and Canadian, was in the vicinity of 10,000, and they say the Germans lost 12,000. The Germans poured shells on us during the whole engagement, lasting about eight days. Anyone who says they are short of ammunition only needs to pay a visit to the fighting lines and he will see and hear enough in fifteen

minutes to disillusion him. All our boys were very cool and brave, and the wounded bore their sufferings stoically, never a groan or complaint."

The *Frankfurter Zeitung*, a very prominent German newspaper, wrote as follows concerning the great stand of the Canadians at St. Julien:—"Much more difficulty was experienced in the attack on the left wing, where the Thuringian troops advanced over Langemarck. The Canadians held an exceedingly strong position many lines deep. When the Canadian situation became critical they brought all the reserves at their disposal for a mighty counter-attack and were really successful in bringing to a standstill the advance of the German troops on a line at the north edge of the wood four kilometers to the westward of St. Julien. Once more the German artillery brought the British position under heavy fire, but still the Canadians did not give way. They carried out the same night a very energetic counter-attack."

In the midst of the tornado of fire, calculated to drive courage from the stoutest hearts, the brave Canadians plunged. Under conditions of warfare much more horrible than those of which the world had previously dreamed, they stood firm. No Canadian soldier hesitated a moment in the hottest of the

fight to take his place in the line alongside the most seasoned troops and regulars of the French and British armies. "This line must not retire!" will be the glorious Canadian slogan for the centuries to come.

Sir Edward Cook, in his "Life of Florence Nightingale," represents her as saying, and there is no motive for a "twisted" report here:

"Upon those who watched, week after week and month after month, this enduring courage, this unalterable patience, simplicity, and good strength, this voiceless strength to suffer and be still, it has made an impression never to be forgotten. The Anglo-Saxon on the Crimean heights has won for himself a greater name than the Spartan at Thermopylae, as the six months' struggle to endure was a greater proof of what man can do than the six hour's struggle to fight. The traces of the name and sacrifice of Iphigenia may still be seen in Taurus: but a greater sacrifice has been there accomplished by a 'handful' of brave men who defended that fatal position, even to the death. And if Inkerman now bears a name like that of Thermopylae, so is the story of those terrible trenches, through which these men patiently and deliberately, and week after week went, till they returned no more, greater than that of Inkerman. Truly were the Sebastopol trenches, to our men, like the gate of the In-

fernal Regions—'*Lasciate ogni speranza, voi ch'entrate.*' And yet these men would refuse to report themselves sick, lest they should throw more labour on their comrades. They would draw their blankets over their heads and die without a word. Well may it be said that there is hardly an example in history to compare with this long and silent fortitude."*

The "handful" of Anglo-Saxons can still do deeds of valour. The blood of the breed is as red as ever and just as highly charged as of old with valorous life-giving energy. We need not look back as far as Inkerman or Balaclava, we have only to turn to Langemarck. Here is the account of the day in laconic and burning phrases:

"With the Canadian Highlanders extended to double their normal trench front, one-half of it in the open, and assisted by the Tenth Battalion from southern Alberta, Manitoba and Saskatchewan, they not only held ten times their own number in check, but they actually retook the guns from the enemy and maintained their position, but the loss, as must have been expected, was appalling."

And this:—

"About six thousand Germans got in the rear of the Highlanders, thus cutting them off,

*"The Life of Florence Nightingale," I, 316. Sir Ed. Cook.

but they refused to surrender, and the firing was heard far into the night, the Germans being in front, on the left flank and on the rear."

Ten to one as at Thermopylae and without the advantage of the narrow pass! Ten to one they not only held their ground, but pushed forward! With no reinforcements in sight, cut off from their comrades, with ammunition all but gone, they fought with the blood dripping from their wounds as red as the cross of the old flag that flew above them. The soldiers of Balaclava and Waterloo could not have done better or accomplished more. No son of Britain could have died better. Canada will never forget them, for they died for the great principles that have welded the British Empire so successfully and thoroughly for many, many years.

"We have more of the breed of the men and the steed
That wore bravely our Waterloo wreath.
We have more of the blood that formed Inkerman's flood,
When it poured in the whirlpool of death.
And the foeman shall find neither coward nor slave,
'Neath the red cross of England, the flag of the brave."

Canada no longer feels as she did before this war—a bare item in a great whole. An idea

has filled her soul, has come to the centre of consciousness. She has seen an arrogant and barbarous foe striking at the very foundation of the civilization of which she is a part. She has observed the mailed fist raised to strike the weaker nations of the world for no other reason than that they were weak. She has heard with bounding heart the cry of the Motherland for aid and has taken up arms to fight. How well she has played her part the German dead at Ypres will forever declare. Colonials were ready to give their best blood for the cause and joyfully to lay down their lives for the Empire's ideals. The words of Faust can as readily be applied to them as to the bravest Teuton:

"O selig der, dem er im Siegesglanze
Die blut'gen Lorbeern um die Schläfe windet."
("O happy he for whom in victory's splendor
Death wreathes the blood-stained laurel round his brow.")*

Letters of congratulation to Canada for the bravery of her soldiers at Ypres came in abundance, through the proper channels. The one most prized by Canadians is from King George. It is as follows:

*Quoted from "Germany and England," page 81. J. A. Cramb.

"His Royal Highness the Duke of Connaught,
Ottawa.

"Congratulate you most warmly on the splendid and gallant way in which the Canadian division fought during the last two days north of Ypres.

"Sir John French says that their conduct was magnificent throughout. The Dominion will be justly proud.

"(Signed) George."

Messages from Field Marshal Sir John French to the Prime Minister of Canada are in a similar strain, in which the phrases "gallant achievements," "splendid distinction," and "valor and heroism," appear. Letters from General Smith-Dorrien to General Alderson express the gratitude of a great army commander who saved the day at Mons and who was quick to recognize that with "less determined troops" the German advance might have been "converted into a serious defeat for our troops."

Among the eight Victoria Crosses given as gazetted on June 23rd, three went to Canadian soldiers—Captain Francis Scrimger, of the Army Medical Service, Color-Sergeant Fred Hall, of the Eighth Battalion, and Lance-Corporal Fred Fisher, of the Thirteenth Battalion. All these were given for "extreme

bravery" in and around Ypres. Seventy other Canadian soldiers, for great bravery, were recognized by the bestowal of the Order of Companion of the Bath, Companion of St. Michael and St. George, and Companion of the Distinguished Service Order. The Distinguished Conduct Medal for valour on the field of strife was awarded to great numbers of the sons of Canadian soil. All this goes to show that it was no sham heroism that Canadians displayed at the crucial battle of Langemarck any more than it was fifteen years before at Paardeburg in South Africa.

German historians never tire of lauding the bravery of their troops on the field of battle. That "grandeur of soul"* that Professor Cramb refers to, has made itself evident on many a field of strife. Certainly it has in this war been covered over and almost extinguished by primitive barbaric instincts. But now and then it bursts forth in a new flame. "German women, too," they assert, "have gone to war; but German women make war, not against flower-beds or golf-links, insensate pillar-boxes or shop windows, but, like soldiers, against soldiers."

No one intends to disparage the bravery of the Teutonic soldiers or the devotion of the

*"Germany and England," pages 34 and 52. Prof. J. A. Cramb.

German women. But every heroic act of the Germans in this war has been matched, and in many cases surpassed, by Colonials. Of course, it is taken for granted that the British and French regulars are always heroes. But we speak now of men who have never known serious warfare until suddenly plunged into an unparalleled world-struggle.

One could easily write an entire book on the brave deeds of the Irish soldiers. There are no truer lovers of liberty in the world than they; and it is because of this devotion to liberty that they have given themselves, soul and body, to the great cause represented in this war. Whatever English rule might be, they have great reason never to allow themselves to fall into the hands of the Teuton. They know as well as the English that the rule of the Hohenzollern means the death of liberty. Thus they are giving their best blood to the cause.

Many of the men who went to the front from Canada were of Irish descent. Chief in bravery among these was Lance-Corp. Michael O'Leary, from Regina, who won the Victoria Cross for conspicuous bravery on the field of battle. Born in Killbarry, near Inchigeelagh, County Cork, he entered the British Navy at sixteen as a stoker. Invalided home from Malta, his devoted mother nursed him back

to health. He then re-enlisted in the Irish Guards and served four years at Buckingham Palace.

Later he came to Canada, and served on the Mounted Police force one year, and when the call to the colours came he returned to England and joined the First Battalion of the Irish Guards.

At Givenchy, in France, on Feb. 1st, a company of the Irish Guards, of which O'Leary was a member, was ordered to keep up a hot rifle and machine-gun fire from the trench that they occupied as a preparation for a quick advance. When the opportune moment arrived No. 1 Company leaped from the trenches with a yell and, presenting fixed bayonets, dashed upon the enemy. Lance-Corporal O'Leary outstripped all the others, and without looking around to see how near his comrades were, came within a few yards of the German trenches.

A German machine-gun was directly in front of him, but before the Germans had time to swing it around and face the charging men, O'Leary had killed the whole five of the machine-gun crew. This accomplished, he dashed forward to the second barricade sixty yards away, shot two more Teutons and made two others prisoners. He thus saved the attacking party from being fired upon.

Although only twenty-four years old he accomplished more than any other man on the side of the Allies. Always a hero at heart, when the opportunity offered he expressed his heroism in such a remarkable manner that neither England nor Canada, who is proud to own him for a brief year, will ever allow his memory to fade, nor the memory of the splendid race of which he is a member.

No general or officer of the British army has received as much well-merited praise as the dashing young hero of the Irish Guards who, by his devotion to the cause of right, saved his company from the withering fire of a machine-gun.

Both Ireland and Canada, as well as the whole of Britain's world-wide Empire, were honoured when Sergeant Michael O'Leary, of the Irish Guards, received at Buckingham Palace the personal congratulations of King George, who was delighted to pin the Victoria Cross upon the hero's breast.

Countess Limerick refers to O'Leary's exploit as the noblest thing in the whole war; and Sir Arthur Conan Doyle declares that it far outstrips any achievement even of fiction, for no writer of fiction would dare to give such a distinction to his most heroic character; but, he adds: "The Irish always have been wonderful fighters."

To-day the recruiting officers both in Canada and England are telling of O'Leary's heroic deeds as an incentive to those who think that there is no chance for glorious achievements upon the battle-field.

The spirit and loyalty of our Canadian soldiers are illustrated by many instances. Here is an example: Peter Joe Martin completed a walk of over a thousand miles from Fort McLeod, on the shores of Hudson Bay, so that he might fight for his King and Country. Last fall he heard a rumour that Britain was at war. Journeying three hundred miles to Fort McLeod, he procured a paper that confirmed the report. This was enough. He sold traps, dogs and furs and hit the long trail for Prince Rupert, shooting his food on the way. From this place he travelled to Prince Albert. Finding no opportunity to enlist here, he went to Battleford and thence to Saskatoon. Finally he succeeded in finding an opportunity to serve his country at the front.

Here is another instance: James Todd, of Saskatoon, accepted by the officers recruiting for the First Contingent, was subsequently rejected at Valcartier because of his legs, which were unusually crooked. Todd, however, was not to be balked, so he entered a city hospital and had both legs broken just a little below

the knee. He is now fighting faithfully for his country.

The relatives in this country of the brave young aviator, Lieutenant Warneford, whom Canada would like to own, will always cherish his memory for incomparable bravery. This is the man who, by sheer skill and daring, brought down a mighty Zeppelin, by flying down upon it and, from a distance of only fifteen metres, dropping a bomb to its destruction. Six bombs were thrown, but the last struck the great airship fair in the middle, and it exploded with such a force that it turned the aeroplane sailing above upside down. But in a few moments the aviator righted his machine and thus escaped the death of the crew of the burning Zeppelin. Space is not sufficient to mention other deeds of bravery that are constantly taking place at the front.

Newfoundlanders have also taken a large part in the struggle. Some of them are at this moment fighting at the Dardanelles against the unspeakable Turk, others took their places by the side of their Canadian brothers at Ypres, and are still giving a good account of themselves in Belgium. It was said of them while at Edinburgh Castle: "No better behaved body of men has ever been garrisoned here." Yet these men were taken from places where

they lived the simple life and were suddenly transferred to temptation, danger and death. But they always did what was expected of them and much more.

Captain Cluny MacPherson, a native of Terra Nova, has done a great service for the Empire, in that he has devised a helmet accepted by the British military authorities as being most efficient for the protection of the soldiers against poisonous gases. He had the honour of being appointed on a Special Committee on Protection Against Poisonous Gases, the other members of which were: Colonel Horrocks, K.H.S., R.A.M.C., as Chairman; Dr. Haldane, of Oxford, and Lieut.-Colonel Egan, Ordnance Officer. Here are his own words in a letter from the War Office to His Excellency the Governor of Newfoundland, under date of June 20th, 1915:

"A formal order has now been issued that the helmet of my pattern is to supersede the respirators which were issued, because they could be so much more speedily manufactured.

"The order is that every man in all ranks is to have two on his person, one at his regimental depot, and one at the ordnance base. Four for each man.

"I have asked for and obtained Sergt. M. J. Murphy, of 'Ours,' a druggist of some years' experience at McMurdo's, and exceptionally

reliable. I had him in France with me, and am taking him over again presently to take charge of one of the depots for reimpregnating the helmets for which I was over this last time to choose the sites."

Australians and New Zealanders fought side by side with Canadians and Newfoundlanders, if not at Ypres, then at the Dardanelles. They are at this very day sharing the dangers, the burdens and the sufferings of their brothers of the other parts of the British Empire. Sir Ian Hamilton, Commander-in Chief of the allied troops at the Dardanelles, speaks words that stamp the Australians as displaying the same heroism as characterized the Greeks in the siege of ancient Troy. He knew that the landing of men on the Gallipoli Peninsula "involved difficulties for which there is no precedent in military history, except possibly in the sinister legends of Xerxes." Yet he made the attempt. In several instances half of the landing parties were killed or wounded before they reached any shelter whatever. Wire network in several lines was constructed, not only on land, but beneath the surface of the sea near the land, and machine guns bristled in every nook of the cliffs. "Long lines of men were mowed down as by a scythe." "Like lightning they (the Australians) leaped ashore, and each man as he

did so went straight with his bayonet at the enemy. So vigorous was the onslaught that the Turks made no attempt to withstand it, and fled from ridge to ridge pursued by the Australian infantry."

The wisdom of British policy can be seen from the fact that she can effectually draw support from her colonies at a time when Germany finds hers falling, one after the other, into the hands of the enemy. Isolation expresses the relation of the German colonies to the Fatherland, while Canada, Australia, South Africa, Newfoundland, New Zealand and India are drawing closer and closer to the Mother Country. It was an Australian warship that destroyed the *Emden* and Australian and New Zealand forces that made the heroic landing on the Gallipoli Peninsula, and are now with English and French troops successfully driving the "unspeakable Turk" back to his lair.

They have all taken their part in the world-struggle. But Canada has not yet done her full share. The call has gone forth for more men, and even now it rings from coast to coast: Canada to the front! The cause so dear to the heart of Canadians is at stake. There are but two alternatives: to submit to the rule of the mailed fist or continue our happy freedom. Canadian troops at the front have covered themselves with glory. Can we

be satisfied to let them shed their blood and do superhuman things for the Motherland and yet stay at home and enjoy barely the reading of it? The congratulations of Sir John French to the Old Guard of Ypres and the commendation of the King must send a thrill through every Canadian bosom. But let us not allow our emotion to die out as a smoldering ember. Canadians, our bravest and best have gone to fight for freedom; let us also answer the call, and quickly.

Earl Kitchener, knowing that Britain is now able to supply arms and ammunition to her soldiers, is making a demand once more upon the "manhood of the country to come forward to its defence." His words are just as applicable to the Canadian as to the Briton. They are as follows: "Let us see that we spare nothing, shirk nothing, and shrink from nothing, if only we can lend our full weight to the impetus which shall carry to victory the cause of our honour and our freedom."*

"The magnificent blonde brute, avidly rampant for spoil and victory," referred to by Nietzsche in his "Genealogy of Morals," has been let loose upon the world, and threatens to destroy our freedom and overrun our land. His aim is "nothing less than the domination

*Speech by Field Marshal Earl Kitchener, London Guild Hall, July 9, 1915.

of Europe and of the world by the Germanic race."* He seeks the total destruction of British power and the shattering of the British Empire. Then the "magnificent blonde brute" will sit upon some lofty crag, wipe the blood of the conflict from his hair, and laugh at the desolation that he has brought to civilization.

Is Canada to stand by while this is going on? Can she remain unmoved while the rest of the Empire is fighting in a grim struggle for the mastery? Can she look with complacency upon the ghastly crimes against humanity of this "magnificent brute"? Can she view the shattering of all the rules of morality, international bonds and the violation of all that humanity holds dear, and yet put forth no effective hand to help?

Oh, for a second St. Bernard—a man like the fiery Abbot of Clairvaux—to preach a Third Crusade throughout Canada and to arouse men to drive out the modern infidels from the holy places of Belgium and France:—

"If it were announced to you that the enemy had invaded your cities, your castles, your lands; had ravished your wives and your daughters, and profaned your temples—which among you would not fly to arms? Well,

*"Pan-Germanism." By Prof. R. G. Usher.

then, all these calamities, and calamities still greater, have fallen upon your brethren. Why do you hesitate to repair so many evils—to revenge so many outrages? Will you allow the infidels to contemplate in peace the ravages they have committed on Christian people? Remember that their triumph will be a subject for grief to all ages and an eternal opprobium upon the generation that has endured it. Yes, the Living God has charged me to announce to you that He will punish them who shall not have defended Him against His enemies. . . Fly then to arms; let a holy rage animate you in the fight, and let the Christian world resound with these words of the prophet, 'Cursed be he who does not stain his sword with blood!'

"Christian warriors, He who gave His life for you, to-day demands yours in return. These are combats worthy of you, combats in which it is glorious to conquer and advantageous to die. Illustrious knights, generous defenders of the Cross—go and conquer!"*

*"Why Another Crusade"? St. Bernard, see p. 20, "World's Famous Orations."—Bryan.

CHAPTER V.

FRANCE JUSTIFIED.

France and Germany have always cherished different national ideals. When the German ideal was introduced into France at once an era of blood began. The outcome was a revolution that stirred the world. In the year 1789, June 17, the *Tiers Etat* constituted itself into the so-called "National Assembly." On June 20th, the day of the *Jeu de Paume,* the Assembly took oath not to separate till it had given France a constitution. Then came the storming of the Bastille, the transference of the National Assembly from Versailles to Paris, the flight and capture of the King, Queen and Royal Family, the attack on the Tuileries by Santerre and the entire downfall of the monarchy. All this took place in France because the German *Weltanschauung* had gained an entrance to this free land. But France would not tolerate it. There was too much Atlantic ozone in the French blood. Thus she threw it out with such terrible earnestness that the whole of the world was greatly astonished at the suddenness and earnestness of the ejection. "Systematized autocracy" would not suit the

French. Even Bismarck, although a great autocrat himself, in the latter part of his life made the astounding statement, "If I were not a Christian, I would be a Republican." This, however, was only wrung from him after he discovered with his keen mind where autocracy was leading the German Ship of State.

The master of autocracy was himself in trouble. The child had climbed into the bathtub, had turned on the water and was unable to turn it off. Certainly, he had planned and perfected this state of affairs himself. He had turned away from every protest by the people that they should have a hand in the rule of the country. He had asseverated again and again that the monarch alone should rule, but now he realized that disaster might come to the Fatherland if a weak Emperor took the helm.

When we come to the beginning of the twentieth century we find the power of the Emperor even greater than that anticipated by Bismarck. His eye was now upon the world. The latter was his parish. The bounds of Germany proper were too narrow. Even Europe was a circumscribed land to the gaze of the German royal autocrat. The influence of Treitschke was already abroad in the land. He "the friend of Bismarck, the apologist of the Hohenzollern and the eager admirer of

Prussian bureaucracy"—had taught that the essence of the State was power and the more power the State possessed the higher it stood on the plane of morality. "World dominion or downfall" was the mighty programme to which the land was now committed.

As soon as Germany—secure as the central member of the Triple Alliance—began to express herself along the line of this new idea, France, seeing her own helplessness, sought to seek security for herself. Thus, the Dual Alliance was consummated in 1896, and a few years after, England joined the Alliance and the Triple Entente was an accomplished fact. Although there were many old quarrels fresh in the memory of the French and Russians, yet they were now struggling for self-preservation and heartily they entered into agreement to preserve their own lives and keep the peace.

Although Prince Buelow expressed himself in the Reichstag as welcoming the Anglo-French agreement in respect to Morocco, yet the German Foreign Office was greatly displeased because of it. Their idea was to get into favour with France against England. When this did not seem to come about by fair means, Germany concluded that it would come by foul. She thus sent Prince Henckel von Donnersmarck to deliver to France an ultimatum on the subject. She actually held

up the mailed fist into the face of the French authorities and said, "You must change your foreign policy in respect to England and Morocco!" And France allowed her Minister to resign. However, beneath the fear that ruffled the surface there was a deep determination on the part of France and England to unite in resisting the great autocrat of Europe.

This was finally done, but not before desperate efforts had been made by Germany to frighten France into submission to her will. Time and time again she had held the sword over her head and at the same time warned the English to keep off, but England always rallied to the help of her heroic and long-suffering ally. Germany's thought was, that if France could be persuaded to break away from England she would soon get the former into her power and finally so "crush her," as Bernhardi would say, that she would soon sink to the level of a secondary power, and thus never "cross" Germany's path again.

But France has known her great arch-enemy for many years now. The history of the past fifty years shows her what she has to expect at the hands of the Teuton. That period of time has also convinced her that English ideals are at bottom her own and that there is even more freedom in Russia than in Germany.

The great principles embodied in the term Democracy were seen to be regnant in England, although a King stood at the head of affairs. These great principles were always dear to the soul of a Frenchman, and although they might have been smothered for a time under the weight of society and fashion and partly crushed by belligerent and imperious neighbours, yet when the opportune moment arrived they came to the surface, made radiant by that deep emotion always characteristic of the French people. At the bottom, therefore, of French resistance may be discovered the driving force of the principles bound up in the word Democracy. France is fighting not merely for bare physical existence but for the preservation of her ancestral ideals and principles.

M. Sabatier has well said: "When a quarrel is for money or for a strip of territory one can make peace without moral loss. To make peace when an ideal is at stake is an abdication; even to think of it is to be false to the voice which tells us that man is born for other things than to enjoy the moral and material heritage of his fathers."

Silently but with stern determination France has thrown herself into this struggle. Within a very short time she discovered the deep import of the war and made up her mind

once for all that she would win. She has never lost sight of that determination. The presence of a German army not far from Paris touched her with fear, but above all there was a splendid optimism born of the thought that although she might be temporarily humiliated by a barbarous foe, yet her heart was pure and God would see that right finally prevailed. France was secure in the thought that her cause was right and she was protecting her own soil from devastation and her own homes from plunder. She was by no means the aggressor.

In this connection it is interesting to note that the Kaiser at one time thought to saddle responsibility for this war upon France. Thus to a French nurse who was taken prisoner with her ambulance near Sedan, the Kaiser said: "Why did France insist on making war on us? Don't you know that France was the first to mobilize?" The nurse murmured something about Belgium. The Kaiser caught at this. "They are always reproaching us with that," he said. "Just listen to me. At Brussels we found absolute proof that a treaty existed between Belgium, France and England, enabling the French and English to attack Germany through Belgium.

"I'll tell you what I think of your fine England," he said with increasing fury. "She is

treachery incarnate. She has betrayed everybody, and me first of all. If I wished she would betray France to-morrow."

We only wish that this were the Kaiser's first lie, for then there would be some hope for his soul. Is it not recorded in the chronicles concerning this war that France strove with all her powers to avert the struggle? When the history of the war is truthfully written, if that should ever be the case, this fact, above all, will be made so clear that even the German mind will grasp and retain it.

So then France has given her whole soul to the task and nobly she is accomplishing it. It is not merely the army that is fighting, but the whole nation itself. From the smallest in social standing to the greatest, every power is bent toward one supreme goal, and that is victory over the enemy. No political quarrel is allowed to detract from the main purpose. Even the pacifists have been won over to the cause and are now as loyal as can be. There is but one will in France to-day, and that is the vindication of her rights in the expelling of a foreign foe from her soil and the upholding of her ancient honour.

This dual purpose has transformed the Frenchman into a hero and has given him a strength that causes the world to wonder. In the trenches, in the factories, at the supply

stations, in the hospitals, he has shown that he possesses a soldier's heart and a patriot's soul. He does not propagate lies to help his cause. He is comparatively silent. He strikes the enemy with all his strength and allows the world to do the talking. He has unlimited capacity to suffer and still be optimistic. At this moment—July 27th—a wave of optimism seems to be flooding Paris, for a thousand or two of soldiers on leave have shown those at home that Germans are now dispirited and surrender readily. The so-called impregnable German line has often been partly broken and shows signs of crumbling. All this is calculated to inspire the soul of the Frenchman.

The French have been able to work miracles, for, under the pounding of the mighty German howitzers and the horrible destruction of Teutonic machine guns, in the very face of the fiercest human onrush that has ever been initiated for the destruction of an innocent people, they have been able to create an army and a technical equipment which are the wonder of the world to-day. The war-machine that it took Germany half a century to create has not only been effectually blocked but a French army with daily improving equipment has arisen as it were from the mother earth to successfully challenge the advance of the most barbarous enemy that has ever carried arms.

France has solid ground for optimism now for she sees Germany on the downgrade without power to get her foot on the brake. At the beginning of the war she had artillery superior to that of the French and the number of her machine guns in infantry regiments as compared with the former was as three to one. The Germans had three regiments of infantry to the French one. In aviation they were also unquestionably superior.

But the tide has undoubtedly turned for the brave Frenchmen. In the French army now there are eleven different kinds of heavy and light artillery, all so easily handled that three weeks' practice can turn an infantry soldier into a competent member of the artillery force. The rapid-fire guns have been manufactured so quickly that the French regiments have now double as many as the German and the inter-relation between cavalry, infantry and artillery is so perfect that the officers of rank are thoroughly capable of commanding any one of the three divisions at will.

The French soldier also thoroughly understands that uniform does not make the man. He is at heart braver than the Teuton. He is fighting to create and not to destroy. He is fighting for freedom and home and not for expansion. He is not aspiring to a bright

place in the sun, but merely for a peaceful home and liberty. The presence of this high motive steels his sword and makes him the bravest of the brave. He knows that France has never lagged when the question of world-liberation was in the balance. Did she not "give her name to the Crusaders?" In the eighteenth century did she not become "a legislator in thought"? Has she not always been ready to take her part in the work of world-betterment? Above all, did not Napoleon, the greatest soldier of the planet, spring from the sacred soil of France? Thoughts such as these constantly well up in the mind of the intelligent French soldier, and are not without their effect on his efficiency as a fighting machine.

On many occasions the Teutonic warriors have fled defeated when their officers were all shot down. But among the French there are always soldiers who are officers at heart, even though not wearing uniform, and who are able to take command when the recognized leaders fall.

At the fierce battle of the Marne a certain battalion had lost all its officers, but there was no sign of weakness anywhere, for a private soldier who that evening on the battlefield had received the rank of a Second Lieutenant and the cross of the Legion of Honour hurled for-

ward the soldiers for the fourth time with great success against the enemy's position. The ranks are filled with men of this stamp displaying, whenever opportunity offers, the same spirit as that of the Old Guard at Waterloo.

Above all other mighty powers in the present conflict is the confidence of the French and English peoples. It is to-day stronger than ever. Certainly Germany as well puts on a show of confidence, but it is the confidence of a nation that has staked all on one foolhardy throw of the dice. Just as German discipline is a forced discipline founded upon fear, so German confidence is a forced confidence founded upon the same degrading emotion. At the outset of the war every French soldier with any intelligence fought under the shadow of the defeats of 1870. The power of suggestion was at work just as strongly with the Frenchman in respect to these defeats as it was with the Teuton in regard to the Neitzsche-Treitschke-Bernhardi notion of "world-dominion." But the victory of Flanders and the now impregnable barrier guarding the road to Paris have given to France the necessary feeling of confidence.

The Germans may now talk as they like of the bravery of their troops, but equal bravery can be found everywhere among the French.

The "slapping of the French swine" so much desired by the blustering Crown Prince has awakened a spirit that is showing itself in something other than a grunt. The "French swine" have turned upon their tormentors so vigorously that we may soon expect to see Germany modify her intentions in reference to them. Bernhardi's ideal seems very far from accomplishment at present and France might be spared to cross her path once more, that is, if the end of the war finds life enough in Germany to be upon "the path" at all.

Napoleon's glowing words to his soldiers during the Egyptian campaign are very appropriate here: "Soldiers, you are masters of the modes of warfare appropriate to mountains, to plains, to sieges. The Roman legions whom you have sometimes imitated, but not as yet equalled, fought Carthage successively upon the sea and upon the plains of Zama. Victory never forsook them, because they were constantly brave, patient of fatigue, well disciplined, resolute. But, soldiers, Europe has her eyes upon you. You have great destinies to fulfil, battles to fight, fatigues to surmount."

Again, what Frenchman's heart does not thrill with patriotic fire at the tender and magnificent words of the great general at Fontainebleau: "I cannot embrace you all, but I embrace your general. Come, General Petit,

that I may press you to my heart. Bring me the eagle, that I may embrace it also. Ah! dear eagle, may this kiss which I give thee find an echo to the latest posterity. Adieu, my children; the best wishes of my heart shall be always with you; do not forget me."

That the blood of Napoleon is still running red in the veins of the heroic Frenchmen guarding the gates of Paris is evident from the deeds of valour being done by them in the defence of their beloved country. Our hearts go out to them because their ideals are our ideals and their God is our God. In our souls the tricolour is blended and entwined with the Union Jack, and the immortal "Marseillaise" touches a chord in our hearts that vibrates in unison with that of our own national song. Our devotion is to France because of the principles that are the foundations of her nationality. Any Britisher, Canadian or American who would stand by and see her share the fate of Belgium would be by that very act forever disgraced. But there is no possibility of this now and our hearts rejoice because of it.

CHAPTER VI

ITALY JUSTIFIED.

The entrance of Italy into this war was fully expected by all nations outside of Germany and Austria. Even Austria was by no means sure that she would succeed in inducing her to maintain her neutrality. That she was justified in taking the step that she took on May 23rd last is admitted by all lovers of freedom.

Certainly Italy had entered into an alliance with Germany and Austria for purposes of defence, and, while the above two nations stood for that, Italy was willing to throw in her lot with them. But Italy was convinced from the very first that this war was not purely for defensive purposes. She saw that it was a war of aggression and consequently held aloof until her national dignity compelled her to take part and assert her rights.

The *London Times* tells us that the diplomatic arrangements called the Triple Alliance consisted originally of an "Austro-German, an Italo-German and an Austro-Italian treaty." But when the Alliance was renewed

in December, 1912, it was compressed into a single treaty with a special "Austro-Italian annex in regard to Albania." This treaty is a triumph of ingenuity and indicates to the reader the keen diplomacy of the war lords of Austria and Germany.

In order to condemn Italy for her step Germany has published in the *Vossische Zeitung* of Berlin from an Austro-Hungarian White Paper certain sections of the now out-of-date Triple Alliance. These sections are naturally those that are most favourable to the Austrian and German standpoint.

Clause III reads thus: "In case one or two of the high contracting parties, without direct provocation on their part, should be attacked by one or more great powers not signatory of the present treaty and should become involved in a war with them, the *casus foederis* would arise simultaneously for all the high contracting parties."

Clause IV: "In case a great power not signatory of the present treaty should threaten the state of security of one of the high contracting parties and in case the threatened party should thereby be compelled to declare war against the great power, the two other contracting parties engage themselves to maintain benevolent neutrality towards their ally. Each of them reserves its right in this case to

take part in the war if it thinks fit in order to make common cause with its ally."

Clause VII: "*Austria-Hungary and Italy, who have solely in view the maintenance, as far as possible, of the territorial status quo in the east,* engage themselves to use their influence to prevent all territorial changes which might be disadvantageous to the one or the other of the powers signatory of the present treaty. To this end they will give reciprocally all information calculated to enlighten each other concerning their own intentions and those of other powers. Should, however, the case arise that in the course of events the maintenance of the *status quo* in the territory of the Balkans or of the Ottoman coasts and islands in the Adriatic or Aegean Sea become impossible, and that either in consequence of the action of a third power or for any other reason, Austria or Italy should be obliged to change the *status quo* for their part by a temporary or permanent occupation, *such occupation would only take place after previous agreement between the two powers,* which would have to be based upon the principle of reciprocal compensation for all territorial or other advantages that either of them might acquire over and above the existing *status quo,* and would have to satisfy the interest and rightful claims of both parties."

There are clear indications in clause No. VII that there was little intention on the part of Germany and Austria that the *status quo* should be maintained. Germany and Austria had left loopholes for their own escape when *Der Tag* would come for the final swoop, and being cognizant of this from the first Italy closed one eye and kept the other "lifting." Meanwhile Austria continued her aggression, assuring Italy all the time in her diplomatic correspondence that neither Austria nor Germany wanted a "foot of land." It was only intended that she would extricate herself honourably from the results of the intrigues of the wicked Serbians and punish them sufficiently.

But the Italian masters of diplomacy could not be "fooled all the time." In fact at heart they were not fooled any of the time, but just as in the case of England and France, war was a serious thing for them and they wished to preserve peace as long as possible. But Premier Salandra finally warned the Chamber of Deputies that "these efforts were bound to have a limit in time and dignity." The long-suffering patience of the Italians was at last over-strained and diplomatic relations were broken off.

Italy now began to demand her rights. She saw that Austria was seeking to retain her

hold upon Serbia and that she, with Germany, would attempt to extend Teutonic influence to the Aegean Sea, giving the Teutons a firmer grip upon Greece and the Balkan States. She perceived this from the very first and in her heart had silently protested. She thus stood apart and silently and sorrowfully watched the activities of her *Bundesgenossen.*

Prince von Buelow, whose wife was a native of Italian soil, was sent to Italy to try and calm the rising Italian spirit. Italy was offered certain parts of Austrian territory as the price of her continued neutrality. But none of her offers were in any way sufficient to satisfy the Italian legitimate expectations.

Moreover, a war-party, led by the "Irredentists," arose and made itself influential with the heads of government. Constantly did this party feed the flames that were fast kindling in the Italian soul. But the German diplomats with characteristic persistence kept up their efforts even until May 10th, six days after Italy renounced the Triple Alliance.

Wild was the enthusiasm in the Italian Chamber of Deputies on May 20th, when the leaders of the Government took their places. When Gabrielle d'Annunzio entered all the deputies shouted: "Viva d'Annunzio! Viva Italia!"

When Premier Salandra, followed by all the Cabinet, entered, once more pandemonium broke loose as a tremendous shout arose: "Viva Salandra! Viva Salandra!" For five minutes the cheering lasted, which brought tears to the eyes of the great Premier.

Before presenting the bill "for the eventual expenditures of a national war," the Premier showed clearly how Italy had been deeply humiliated by Austria-Hungary and how, for the sake of peace, she had submitted. The "equilibrium of the Balkans," he said, had been broken by Austria and Italian interests there had been seriously disturbed. Italy had always stood for peace and concord and had in the past made great sacrifices to preserve them. European equilibrium was the great object sought for many years, and this was the great reason for her system of agreements and friendships. While putting forth every effort to accomplish this she had noticed with grave concern the systematic efforts of a nation, bound to her by treaty obligations, to suppress Italian characteristics and the Italian language in certain districts that were fundamentally Italian. Austria had worked with great zeal towards this end, taking every opportunity to thwart Italian civilization and the people of Italian blood. The language of the governing classes was imposed with such

assiduity that in many places the Italian tongue had completely died out. Families of Italian ancestors had become Dalmatian or Croatian. The beloved Premier ended his reflections by exclàiming: "We have confidence in our august chief, who is preparing to lead the army towards a glorious future. Let us gather around this well-beloved sovereign. Italy must be united at this moment, when her destinies are being decided."

It is certain that the Austrians have treated Italy shamefully and in such a way as to deserve Italian hatred. Great efforts had been made, with the connivance of the Government at Vienna, to denationalize Istria, Trentino and Trieste, to kill out the love of country that burned within the bosoms of the Italian inhabitants. Pola, too, is known to be essentially Italian. Yet the Vienna Government, by counting the members of a large garrison, managed to find but few Italians there.

Trieste, again, is nearly as Italian as Rome itself, yet great efforts have been made to Teutonize it. All the Government employees are Teutons or Slavs, and to use the Italian language in official documents would be regarded as a disgrace. Leagues and clubs of Slavs and Teutons are found in every place

for the carrying out to the letter of the Austrian "Monroe Doctrine."

The burning question before Italy for the last few years has been: How is this part of Italy to be redeemed? How is this part of Austrian territory to be saved to the Italian race? This land around the head of the Adriatic Sea is already Italian save in respect to nationality. Italy's legitimate task is to bring about, in some way, the annexation of this territory. But the Austrian door is closed and a ruthless enemy has turned the key and placed it in his pocket.

While these thoughts were burning in the soul of the intelligent Italian, last July a severe ultimatum, addressed by the Austro-Hungarian empire to Serbia, came as a shock from which Italy has hardly yet recovered. It came as a shock because it annulled at one stroke the treaty that existed between Italy and Austria. It violated the treaty as to its form, for it omitted even to notify Italy concerning Austria's intentions, and it broke the treaty in substance, for it unbalanced in a way hurtful to Italy the equilibrium of the Balkan States and made necessary a dreadful war which was altogether in contravention of Italian interests and wishes.

For the steps that were taken by Italy before she renounced her treaty with Austria the

reader is referred to the Green Book of the Italian Government. What a mass of diplomatic correspondence appears here! First there is the notification of the Austrian foreign minister, Count von Berchtold, that Italy is entitled to compensation for the attack on Serbia according to treaty and the refusal of the Minister to entertain it. Then comes the evasion of the whole question by Baron Burian, who succeeded Count von Berchtold. On March the 9th, however, Baron Burian thought it well to notice the Italian demands as they were laid down by Foreign Minister Sonnino. Then came a provisional agreement in which certain concessions were made to Italy which Signor Sonnino had no hesitation in calling "contemptible."

With this "contemptible" report before him which humiliated Italy beyond measure, Sonnino, the Italian Foreign Minister, denounced the alliance with Austria-Hungary, showing that Italy's advice in reference to moderation in the Serbian ultimatum of July 23rd was spurned and the Balkan equilibrium broken merely for the advantage of Austria. This demanded that Italy take up arms to save her national honour and to redeem that part of the nation that had been transplanted in the step-motherly Austrian soil.

Italy, the land of glorious traditions, of

romantic history and brave soldiers, would not consent to be humiliated by Austria. The land of Scipio Africanus, who conquered Spain and twice defeated Hasdrubal, and of his mighty father, Publius Cornelius Scipio, who destroyed the fleet of Carthage and won for Rome the mastery of the sea in the brave days of old, rightly refused to submit to an aggressive nation with no history and no glorious traditions. The country whose soil was trodden by the Gracchi, Cicero, Mark Antony, Cato and Julius Caesar in the olden times, and Mazzini, Garibaldi and Cavour in later days, could not be expected to submit very long to the blandishments of Von Buelow or accept without a struggle the contemptible offers of the Austrian Government.

The pride of the modern Italian in his country is more than justified, for the six-hundred-mile peninsula was once and for a long time the mistress of the world. British national history is only a day compared with the history of Italy. Gibbon's "Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire" displays before our eyes a marvellous series of events that almost bewilders us, and the reader is soon convinced that the "Roman Empire" was at least once and for ten centuries the central influence of the world. In some important things it leads the world to-day.

Italy has tried every form of government from dictatorship to monarchy. Every trick of modern political life has been attempted, and the history of Italy is on a small scale the history of the civilized world.

The ground is full of romance and interest. From the proud city of Florence, which nurtured Savonarola and Lorenzo, soldiers are now pouring forth. From Milan, the city of Cicero, the accuser of Catiline and of the immortal but unfaithful Brutus, defenders of Italy's ancient honour are being mustered to the sound of martial music. Pisa, the city of Galileo, the true founder of inductive philosophy, and Naples, the home of Virgil of old and of the famous Giovanni Battista Vico, the founder of the philosophy of history of more modern times, are sending forth their brave battalions to oppose their unscrupulous enemies.

Italy has at last aroused herself from her slumbers and is making a supreme effort to redeem her own land from the Hapsburg yoke. Austria has been shaking her fist in the face of Italy for many years. Lombardy and Venice were long under the sway of Austria and Parma, Modena and Tuscany under Hapsburg Princes. Finally, thanks to the patriots of Piedmont and the efforts of Cavour, Mazzini and Garibaldi, Lombardy was wrested

from the influence of Austria and shortly afterward Modena, Tuscany and Parma joined the union and when Naples and Sicily offered the open hand, Italy once more became a unit with a brave king, the beloved Victor Emmanuel, at its head.

Austria has never really had the sympathy of the Italian people. The robber-nation could not expect it although she often flattered herself that it was in her possession. The national heart never really desired an alliance with the Hapsburgs. A vote of the people at its initiation would have nipped it in the bud. Thus as soon as Germany demanded that Italy aid in the war, strong opposition arose in the Italian bosom. The Irredentists, the old agitators, began a mighty propaganda which soon influenced a willing people to throw their weight upon the side of freedom and right.

Italy has always been a military nation and her people have many times proved themselves to be brave and determined fighters on the field of strife. With a million men who can soon be made available and a regular army of 515,000, her weight in the balance on the side of right is by no means small. She possesses the best mountain soldiers in the world and her 180 squadrons of cavalry cannot be surpassed.

The Italian fleet is not by any means to be despised, for it is far superior to the fleet of Austria. Besides her dreadnoughts, she has an immense fleet of destroyers, torpedo boats, and at least twenty submarines. As the German boats are not available for conflict we may soon expect to hear of the capture of many seaport towns and the destruction of the enemy's ships that may have the hardihood to fight.

Germany is naturally very bitter because of the entry of Italy into the war. Dr. von Bethmann-Hollweg, the German Imperial Chancellor, in a speech before the Reichstag, on May 28th, made use of the following words in reference to Italy: "Italy has now inscribed in the book of the world's history, in letters of blood which will never fail, her violation of faith. Nobody threatened Italy—neither Austria-Hungary nor Germany. Without a drop of blood flowing, or the life of a single Italian endangered, Italy could have secured the long list of concessions which I recently read in the House—territory in Tyrol and on the Isonzo, as far as Italian speech is heard, satisfactions for her national aspirations in Trieste, a free hand in Albania, and the valuable port of Avlona."

All this is very well in the Reichstag, and it would look very nice in an Austrian treaty,

but Italy could not trust either Austria or Germany. For these nations a treaty is only a "scrap of paper" which may be torn up when occasion demands. Germany certainly had guaranteed that the Austrian concessions would be made good. But all the world has seen what the German guarantee amounts to or what it stands for. The integrity of Belgium was guaranteed, but when the time came for the march on Paris, Germany never hesitated to violate the guarantee. The treaty was not made for times of peace, but for times of stress and for periods of strained relations between countries. But when the time of stress came, Germany deliberately trampled down the nation concerning which Herr von Jagow, the German Secretary of State, remarked to Baron Beyens, the Belgian Minister in Berlin, at the beginning of the war, that "Germany had no reproach to make against Belgium, and the attitude of Belgium has always been perfectly correct."

The brave Italian army has made rapid advances into the enemy's territory within the last few weeks; Italian artillery has rendered invaluable assistance. The men behind the guns on the Isonzo front and on other parts of the firing line are proving themselves to be the bravest of the brave, and by their coolness,

bravery and the deadly accuracy of their marksmanship are winning the admiration of the civilized world. Against the asphyxiating bombs and other devilish devices of the enemy they are making advances and will ultimately win a glorious victory. All hail to Italy!

CHAPTER VII.

AMERICAN NEUTRALITY AND PEACE.

When the author of "The Peace and America" made use of the phrase: "I feel in the depths of my soul the need of professing my faith and my conviction," he touched the very heart of that attitude that forced upon the world a destructive and bloody war. Why should he impose upon a world without sympathy for his attitude, his own faith and conviction? Why should he think that his judgments are truer than those of the majority of Americans when truths are defined by him as judgments that correspond with reality? His mind is undoubtedly biased beyond that of the ordinary "reader of newspapers," for he has been subjected all along to the "fierce light" that shines from the German luminary, as well as to that which flashes from the German press, and Count von Bernstorff and Herr Dernburg have exercised themselves, helping him to make the light of such a character that it will not be hurtful to American eyes.

The longing for peace, the author asseverates, is deep within his heart. But why the longing

for peace now? Has it not come too late for Europe? Is it not immeasurably too late for the Belgian people? If the longing for peace had been general and permanent in the German heart, why the forty years of preparation for war, and why did the German sailor on every gala occasion drink enthusiastically to *Der Tag?* If there is no place in the German soul for hate, why decorate with the Iron Cross the man who writes a "Hymn of Hate"? If the Teutonic peoples do not want an acre of land beyond their own, why shed the blood of their bravest millions in the trenches on Belgian soil? These are questions that neutral nations are asking to-day with much persistence.

Calmly, the good doctor proceeds: "At the Marne and the Vistula the flag of peace can never be unfurled."* But where, we may ask, is the River Marne? Is it not in the heart of France and one of its great arteries? Why should the German vampire have fastened itself upon this vital artery of French life? "The flag of peace can never be unfurled at the Marne." The meaning of this sentence is that "France," at whatever cost, "must be crushed." Her life-blood must be shed by the great Teutonic murderer, and the world out-

*"The Peace and America," page 6. Münsterberg.

side the belligerents is asked to stand by and look on without a protest. The reptile will not return to its lair until France is destroyed, so says the author of the "Peace and America," and turns with pleading hands to the American people and begs for "neutrality." But what business has the Teuton on the Marne? What right has he in Belgium? No German territory is devastated, no German homes are ravished, no German cathedrals are destroyed. The aggressor has done his work and now calls upon Americans for support.

The whole of the American nation prays for peace, he says, and yet exports munitions of war. What else could the gentle Münsterberg expect? The smallest grain of imagination would have helped him here. Must not a nation, as well as an individual, act along the line of its prayer, if the latter is to be effective? Prayers uttered in the void are of no avail. The Kaiser, himself, prays earnestly and yet finds it necessary to go to the front in person to encourage his generals to make the most strenuous efforts to crush the Russians. If America prays for peace, this does not mean that it requests peace at any price. The fact is, as the guardian of the principles involved in the solidarity and integrity of Europe, she finds it greatly against her wishes that Germany should possess nearly the whole of Bel-

gium and a large part of France. America wishes peace, but not a peace that winks at the destruction or humiliation of an heroic people.

The bid for neutrality means that America is requested needlessly to cut off a great deal of her foreign trade. Certainly, if Germany could get her hands on any of the foodstuffs or munitions of war exported from the United States, nothing would be said on the point. But she cannot do this, prevented as she is by the British navy. It is as if a family quarantined for diphtheria in a city, and, not being able, because of this, to get the milkman to deliver milk, should cry out against the milk trust delivering the white fluid to all the other inhabitants of the city. "Stop your milk supply!" the family protests. "Why?" enquire the authorities. "Because you are not supplying it to us," answers the affected family. But everyone can see that there is a reason for the course taken in the case of the latter.

The author of "The Peace and America" goes on calmly in this strain: "America has disregarded her historic mission as peacemaker, not only by sending munitions of war to the European battle-fields, but much more by sacrificing the noble rôle of the non-partisan." Does the learned Doctor think that

Americans cannot see through this now well-worn accusation? It means that America is called upon to give up her trade in munitions in order that Germany may gain an advantage. One nation prepares for war for forty years, and lays up tremendous stores of shells and other ammunition. Then when the time is ripe, she makes war and naturally uses all her powers to hinder the nations that have had little but peace in mind for many years, from obtaining what she already has in abundance. The enormous and protracted preparations of the vampire nation are evident from the fact that over a thousand carloads of shells were used against the Russians when they were compelled to withdraw from the city of Lemberg, the capital of Galicia. With all this in mind the Germans are saying to America: "You must give up exporting munitions of war, because it is impossible for us to take them." But would the ceasing to send munitions of war be a neutral act on the part of America? It would certainly be a great breach of neutrality, for it would be a refusal to allow belligerents to be on an equality in respect to material for warfare. It would be discrimination with a vengeance. America is, no doubt, willing to give to Germany all the arms she can take and more, too, but the trouble is Germany cannot take them. Because

Germany cannot take them, America is requested to refrain from exporting them altogether.

Now this man is supposed to know something about logic and, belonging to the Kantian school he (as Kant) should not allow his logic to be influenced by sentiment as the Pragmatists do and as F. C. H. Schiller, of Oxford, in particular, does. He has now, however, for purposes of argument, gone over to the Pragmatic School. His logic is the bare logic of sentiment expressed by the phrase "Blood is thicker than water." Now this is all very well for Münsterberg. He thinks as a German and feels as a German, but indications are that he will never become a man, so far as unbiased logic is concerned. No one would object to his writing a book in German and for the German people. But he is preaching in the English tongue ideas and ideals that are foreign to the American people. The purpose is very clear, namely, to influence them and to attempt to show them that they are wrong in their attitude in respect to the war. He dictates to the Government of the United States and exonerates only President Wilson. We might add that this is indeed no compliment to President Wilson, for it carries with it the notion that the President does not actually represent the deepest voice of the American

people. Perhaps, however, the next book will not be so favourable to the chief magistrate of the American Republic, for since the writing of "The Peace and America," the greatest tragedy of the war has happened. The *Lusitania* has gone down and a stern warning has gone forth to Germany concerning her submarine warfare.

The United States in her deepest heart does not say: "Let us have peace under any circumstances." What she does demand is: "Peace and righteousness, one and inseparable, now and forever." She understands clearly that the triumph of Germany would never yield these. The American people are not so mercenary as our author imagines. He forgets that English ideals are still dear to American hearts, and these ideals are liberty, fraternity and equality. To attain peace at the cost of these is too great a price to pay. Every public prayer has a hidden meaning that is sometimes brought out and made clear to others besides the initiated few. The prayer of the United States is for a peace that will guarantee the integrity and not the destruction of her own highest ideals, for they are identical with the ideals of Britain and her Allies.

Sometimes a war is initiated and developed in order to carry out a policy that certain poli-

ticians have projected. In such a case the soldiers are fighting without knowledge as to why they are fighting, and when the politicians have served their ends the conflict ceases. But this war is not of that nature. It is a war that rises from the abysses or comes up from the depths. It is a war of principles. Mr. Moreby Acklom, writing in New York, a little while ago, correctly describes it as "no mere match-contest for 'points,' but a grim, life-and-death grapple of two eternally opposing principles, one of which must be overcome before any peace worthy the name can come to Europe."

No one has emphasized the difference between the German and English ideals better than Professor J. A. Cramb, M.A., late Professor of Modern History at Queen's College, London. His book entitled "Germany and England," already referred to, pictures the German point of view with great clearness, and calls forth from Münsterberg high commendation. This is what Professor Cramb says of the ideal of the German people: "That highest-being, that highest ideal, is world-dominion; it is world-empire; it is the hegemony of a planet. It assigns to Germany in the future a rôle like that which Rome or Hellas or Judaea or Islam has played in the past. That is Germany's hero-ideal."

England has sunk into a torpor and her power is gradually failing, with the Colonies ready to drop as ripe apples at the shaking of the parent tree. And who is to snatch the rule from her paralyzed hand? Why, Germany, of course!

"And having visualized this future, the German imagination, in a tempest of envy or vehement hate, becomes articulate and takes various shapes, resulting in an almost complete arraignment of the British Empire, of the English character, and of all our institutions and all our efforts as an empire-building race."*

Heinrich von Treitschke, in his lectures on politics, makes very clear to the reader the German attitude in respect to problems of the State. No one can read these lectures and have any doubt as to what the German military ideal is. Here are a few thoughts from the lectures referred to: "It is a defect of English civilization that it does not know universal military service."† The "manly energies" of the English nation are only preserved by continual warfare in the colonies. There is no "chivalry" in the English or American characters, because instead of using the "noble

*"Germany and England," page 26. J. A. Cramb.

†Politik. Heinrich von Treitschke.

weapons," that is, the sword and revolver, they waste their time at the coarse games of football and baseball. The true State expresses its energy in a great army representative of mighty power. It is only to the superficial observer that war appears inhuman. The Teuton has searched deep into the heart of the State and discovered her needs and conditions, and is fully convinced of the "moral majesty of war." Man is justified in murdering his brother-man and stifling the highest feelings of the human soul in order to make the State Ideal prevail. Let us then, by all means, have war and continual warfare, for it preserves mankind from becoming degenerate. "It would positively be a mutilation of human nature if we tried to banish war out of the world." There is no room in the world for a weak State. It becomes a sham and a mockery. "There is no room for it in a world governed by valour, by the Will to Power."

Here we have the German ideal set forth with great energy by the prince of modern German historians. At Leipzig, at Freiburg, at Kiel, at Heidelburg, and at Berlin, he taught with tremendous energy and earnestness the doctrine that might was right and weakness whether in an individual or in the State was the sin against the Holy Ghost. Professor Meyer refers in a brilliant manner

to his earnestness and honesty, asserting that "he would have suffered martyrdom at any moment for what he said,"* and that everyone who heard him was deeply impressed with the depth and tenacity of his convictions. Such a man was Heinrich von Treitschke, the incarnation of the Teutonic military ideal.

Following in the wake of Treitschke is the less scholarly but equally belligerent Von Bernhardi. He simply takes the ideas of Nietzsche and Treitschke and draws the practical conclusions in concrete cases. There is no third alternative for the Fatherland. It must have one of two things—"*Weltmacht oder Niedergang.*" It must have dominion from the borders of Russia to the Pillars of Hercules. This is the divine idea conceived by Germany. This is the gospel according to Nietzsche, Treitschke, and Bernhardi. This is the apocalypse that has appeared time and time again to a hardy, virile and belligerent race.

Von Bernhardi expresses the ideal in the following words: "We must rouse in our people the unanimous wish for power in this sense, together with the determination to sacrifice on the altar of patriotism, not only life and property, but also private views and

*"Deutsche Literatur des Neunzeshnten Jahrhundert." Prof. Meyer.

preferences in the interests of the common welfare. Then alone shall we discharge our great duties of the future, grow into a World Power, and stamp a great part of humanity with the impress of the German Spirit."*

We have now clearly before us the German military ideal. Let us, in a few words, contrast it with the aim of British imperialism, as it appears in the last two centuries and over. The aim has been to preserve the highest "tolerance in religion," the "love of free institutions," a "reverence before the mysteries of life and death," and a pursuit of the deepest justice that the English mind could imagine.

The British subject is not barely loyal to a race or even to an idea when that idea is seen to lead to destructive activities. He can put aside an idea if he sees clearly that it will involve the nation in a disastrous war. The German, however. is a slave to his idea and, without imagination, pushes it to its logical conclusion. He doesn't originate many ideas himself, but goes to his enemies to find them, and when once he has found them he adopts them without criticism. For instance, Treitschke and Bernhardi do not hesitate to take the principles of Darwin and Spencer and

*"Germany and the Next War," page 114. F. von Bernhardi.

apply them beyond the sphere for which these men intended them. Bernhardi tells us that "nature is ruled by an unceasing struggle for existence—and the law of struggle for existence applies also to men." Notwithstanding Huxley's warning that "social progress involves the checking of the cosmic process at every step," he applies, without hesitation, the biological law or regulative principle to the world of men. There is, he says, no "real civilization" and no "advancement of the race" without it. But the being who invented as a scientific instrument this biological law for a particular purpose, need not apply it to himself as a moral individual, and in fact, the majority of men do not. They design to use other regulative principles for their moral life here below. The German mind, however, bereft of imagination, can never be made to understand that a law applicable in one world need not be used in another. A law used in one sphere, called forth by the necessities of the situation, can be ruled out of order in another by the same spirit that first designed it as an instrument of investigation. For instance, determinism, useful in the sphere of physical science, is replaced by freedom in the field of ethics.

Spencer's law of the "survival of the fittest" is, without hesitation, applied by German his-

torians to individuals and nations. "War gives a biologically just decision, since its decisions rest on the very nature of things." Man has, however, a nature higher than the lower animals, and the fact that all nature below man follows a path interpreted as the path of the "survival of the fittest in the struggle for existence," is no reason that he should placidly submit his higher mental nature to the guidance of that law, for, in fact, the very law in question has proceeded from his own inventive intellect. Immanuel Kant would set us right here: "The Understanding makes Nature, but does not create it." Evolution has its limitations as well as every other principle.

There is certainly a process in the lower animal world which, when interpreted by man, is called nature's plan for the elimination of the weak. But scientific men to-day are seeing the onesidedness of the principle as never before and are drawing attention to the fact that the importance of the law has been unduly exaggerated. They have been bringing in factors unnoticed by Darwin and showing their importance. For instance, everywhere in nature the sacrificial principle is evident. Wherever in the physical world there is parenthood there is self-sacrifice. Every blade of grass in the summer field gives itself for its

offspring, and as one ascends the scale of life this activity is more and more pronounced. The law of self-sacrifice is universally stamped upon nature. And again, the very law of the survival of the fittest is turned upside down in warfare, for the physically strongest men do not survive, but die in the trenches as they are dying at this moment, while the physically weak remain at home and retain their lives until death comes naturally.

As the German ideal, therefore, is related to and grew out of a crude biological principle or methodological instrument made to go on all fours in a world for which it was never intended, it will certainly be shattered before long by the spiritual power of another ideal. The latter has made its bid for recognition and the spiritual value of bare physical force is fast becoming small in the eyes of thinking men. The ideal of bare unreasoned authority and power was very useful in the age of the sons of Atreus—Agamemnon and Menelāus—but is out of date in the twentieth century, and the nation that lives by it alone is not fitted to survive in the struggle for higher existence. The names of Jesus the Divine man, and Paul, and Stephen, and of others whose weapons were wholly spiritual, will live when those of Achilles, Ajax, Hector,

Nestor, Agamemnon and Von Hindenburg have passed out of memory.

Nothing can represent the German military ideal as portrayed by the great Teutonic historians and writers better than the activities of the Greeks against the Trojans—a conflict belonging to an age when physical prowess was regarded as the only divine possession, and nothing but weakness was regarded as wicked and sinful. Here is the picture given by Homer of the Bismarckian Achilles pursuing the Trojans without mercy:

"Dashed from their hoofs, while o'er the dead they fly,
Black bloody drops the smoking chariot dye.
The spiky wheels through heaps of carnage tore;
And thick the groaning axles dropped with gore.
High o'er the scene of death Achilles stood,
All grim with dust, all horrible in blood.
Yet stiff, insatiate, still with rage on flame;
Such is the lust of never-dying fame."

Standing forth to challenge the great moral idea of liberty as represented by the whole world outside of Germany, is the great Teutonic Goliath. His spear is like a weaver's beam and his hands are dyed in blood. He has shaken himself loose from all international obligations and all unwritten laws of humanity except his own, which can be seen written upon his forehead in these words:

"Always and everywhere might is right and the sword is the only angel of peace."

The challenge is flung not merely in the teeth of the British Empire and of French and Russian civilization; it is hurled in the face of all people that stand for ideals of liberty and equality. American ideals have been attacked as well as British. Chains and slavery have been forged at Essen for the authorities at Washington as well as for those in the British capital. How can it be otherwise? Man's every activity is guided by some kind of law, and when the laws of a nation's moral life are attacked even though indirectly there is danger of ultimate slavery to the brute force of the attacking power. The moral idea of liberty is a far more powerful instrument to bind the hearts of men than that of unquestioned obedience to power. This great idea has bound all parts of the British Dominion into a tenacious body and so warmed the heart of every subject that he would "drain his dearest veins" for it. It was this idea that steeled the swords of the gallant Six Hundred at Balaclava, and it was nothing less that hurled the vast battalions of the American North upon the vast battalions of the South and struck off the chains of the down-trodden black.

President Wilson knows as well as any English diplomat or any Canadian statesman that, at bottom, Britain and her Allies are fighting as truly for the unity of America as for the solidarity of the other great nations apart from Austria and Germany. Mr. Asquith is thus perfectly right in his statement that "there is not a man or woman who has seen what is hanging in the balance but also has, during the past year, become greatly conscious that the battle in which we are engaged touches interests and ideals far beyond the shores of these islands, beyond even the confines of our world-spread Empire, and realizes that it concerns the whole future of humanity."

A nation is nothing without her ideals and well-seasoned interests. Apart from these it is but a group of conscious beings moving hither and thither—little items of existence with the power of conscious motion but with no organization. The ideals are the cement that keeps the items together, and they are so important in the eyes of a people that they would "spend the last farthing of their money, the last ounce of their strength, and the last drop of their blood" to maintain them.

The English, French and Italian ideals are identical with the American, so that in the present conflict of ideals, that which is most vital in American life, that which distin-

guishes America as a nation, that which makes her worthy to be called a people and not a mere herd of conscious beings with gregarious instincts, has been seriously attacked, namely, her national ideal. Who has been audacious enough to be the aggressor? Why, the very Germany concerning whose outrageous warfare the author of "The Peace and America," would have the American people preserve a super-neutrality.

And this is not all. American ships have been sunk and American lives have been sacrificed. Nevertheless our author greatly desires that the insulted people should be as he pretends to be, that is, "peaceful as old age." "The historic mission" of America, he intimates, is to remain impartial and not to lift a finger to help on the cause so dear to her own heart. "Only one nation was blessed by perfect freedom from entanglement, only one nation had the strength and the economic independence and the international power and the moral right and the historic duty to become the one truly neutral arbiter and helper, the United States of America."* America has wasted "the glorious hour" and "deepest sorrow" comes to the German soul (if he has one) concerning her actual position in respect to this struggle. A little while ago

*"The Peace and America," page 6. Münsterberg.

it was thundered from all the pulpits that the Krupps and the Creuzots were the great springs of the war, now America is supplying munitions herself. America, officially neutral, has not lived up to her obligation.

One remark seems in order here and that is this: The self-restraint of the United States, under the leadership of the greatest President that she has ever had, is little short of miraculous. She has had to look on while a mad and unscrupulous nation was tearing away the foundations of modern, and, therefore, of her own civilization. A certain amount of latitude was allowed Germany, for she might have thought that she was right. But this alone does not exonerate a nation or clear it from punishment, if it attempts to break up a well-governed civilization. A maniac is sincere enough in his efforts but the authorities do not, for this reason, allow him to run amuck. They place him where he can do no more mischief, and the citizens, instead of blaming the municipal powers for lack of neutrality in the matter, are glad that the insane man is put in the right place.

If a military caste has so imposed itself upon a people that the very categories of thought of the people are twisted and their ideas of right and wrong perverted, and if these people do not blame themselves, others

must blame them and show them with the whip, if necessary, the path of righteousness. This task has so far fallen to the Allies and America has preserved a marvellous neutrality.

No one can follow the kaleidoscopic events in the history of the United States during the last eleven months without being astonished at the wonderful forbearance of this famous nation. America has refused to be stampeded by either the enemies of Germany or of civilization. American citizens have time and again been ruthlessly murdered by a barbarous people, but America has kept her head while firmly demanding that ample compensation be made. It is true, as the "peaceful" Münsterberg calmly asserts, that "no cannon balls will be aimed toward the Woolworth Building," but it is even truer that torpedoes have been aimed at something a thousand times more precious, namely, American lives. It is true that "a great change" is coming in American opinion and activity, "signs of which suggest themselves daily more under the surface. You cannot fool all the people all the time." But the change is by no means favourable to the enemies of civilization. The change is for the better, and our author felt this at the time of writing, but hoped it was not the case. He looks to the youth of

America to aid Germany's cause. But the youth of America love liberty and hate militarism more than those of riper years, for the very air of America is impregnated with freedom. Americans know that the war-cry, *"Gott strafe England!"* now proclaimed broadcast in Germany and embossed upon brooches and other ornaments, would soon, upon a decisive German victory, be changed into *"Gott strafe Amerika!"* They know that the hate of seventy million Germans only awaits encouragement for its spluttering venom to be directed against "the land of the free" itself. The very "purity of their youth and their love of fairness in sport have kept alive their sense of justice."* And "theirs is the true voice of to-morrow." Ah, but in the face of broken pledges and the blood of their relations barbarously slain, these very youths will cry out for vengeance with a voice that will be heard from the Atlantic to the Pacific. "America's public opinion will change." Yes, it has changed already, but not in favour of the Teutonic policy of sinking neutral merchant ships and taking the lives of American citizens.

The strict fairness of President Wilson appeared prominently first in his famous Maryland address, in which he referred to

*"The Peace and America," p. 264. Münsterberg.

"these days of great perplexity when blind material forces are at work around us." He also intimated that because the "impartial tribunal" of time had not laid bare the causes of the war and because of the great work that America would be called upon to do in the making of peace, her place was to maintain strict neutrality.

Again, at the annual luncheon of the Associated Press in New York, April 20th, the President referred very minutely to the "great distinction that awaited the United States when the hour of readjustment should come, provided she could prove to the world her self-control and self-mastery."

"My interest in the neutrality of the United States," he continues, "is not the petty desire to keep out of trouble. I have never looked for it, but I have always found it. I do not want to walk around trouble. If any man wants a scrap that is an interesting scrap and worth while, I am his man. I warn him that he is not going to draw me into the scrap for his advertisement, but if he is looking for trouble, that is, the trouble of men in general, and I can help a little, why then, I am in for it.

"But I am interested in neutrality because there is something so much greater to do than fight—because there is something, there is a distinction, waiting for this nation that no

nation has ever yet attained. That is the distinction of absolute self-control and self-mastery. Whom do you admire most among your friends? The irritable man? The man out of whom you can get a 'rise' without trying? The man who will fight at the drop of the hat, whether he knows what the hat is dropped for or not?

"Don't you admire and don't you fear, if you have to contest with him, the self-mastered man who watches you with calm eye and comes in only when you have carried the thing so far that you must be disposed of? That is the man you respect. That is the man who you know has at bottom a much more fundamental and terrible courage than the irritable, fighting man."

These are the words of a great statesman and a reasonable diplomat. They indicate the earnest effort of the President of a great republic to maintain strict neutrality. But this did not mean that Americans should smother all their feelings and that the merchants should voluntarily renounce millions of dollars worth of trade. The merchants and manufacturers are not required to cease exportation of arms and foodstuffs to whatever nation can receive them. This was clearly indicated by the American note to Germany April 21st in reply to a memoran-

dum of April 4th made and presented by Count Bernstorff, one of the great American triumvirate in the pro-German propaganda. In this note President Wilson correctly indicated that to place any embargo on arms during the war would be "a direct violation of the neutrality of the United States." And this neutrality "is founded upon the firm basis of conscience and good-will."

No protest comes from the German Government against the exportation of arms from the United States to the enemies of Germany, but a whole tribe of hyphenated writers call the American people hypocrites and, as Professor Hart of Harvard has said, place them on "the black books of the powerful German nation." Neutrality without doubt allows the exportation of munitions of war by the merchants and manufacturers of a neutral country, but it requires that a neutral government shall not aid a belligerent. No military body must enter or leave the country and no American can enlist in his own land.

The Hague Convention of 1907 declared that "a neutral state is not bound to prohibit the exportation or transit, for the account of either belligerent, of arms, munitions of war and in general of anything which may be useful for an army or a fleet."

It has always been the custom for neutral nations to sell munitions of war to any country in a position to take them. Even Germany at the time of the Boer war sold arms to Great Britain to be used against the Boers, although at the same time the sympathies of the Germans were with the latter.

It would, thus, be an entirely unneutral act to begin now, after the war has been going on nearly a year, to hinder the exportation of arms to the detriment of one side in the struggle. The Triple Alliance cannot get the supplies from across the water, but the Triple Entente can by virtue of the fact that it controls the sea. Refuse to give them supplies and you make of no value the possession of a great fleet and a superlative naval power.

Count Bernstorff would naturally desire the United States to take a most unneutral step, namely, to change its own laws of neutrality during the progress of the war. This President Wilson refused to do, and consequently many a German cursed and said between his teeth: *"Gott strafe Amerika! Gott strafe Wilson!"*

Germany herself has wrested the palm-branch of neutrality from the United States of America. A strict neutrality was possible until the time of the greatest tragedy ever perpetrated by any nation, namely, the sinking

of the noble Cunard liner, the *Lusitania.* Before this it was easy enough calmly to intimate that "three thousand miles of cool and silent ocean" rolled between the United States and the tragedy being enacted in Europe. Certainly, treaties were torn up, neutral nations invaded and Hague conventions thrown aside, but American blood to any extent had not been shed and the struggle seemed a long distance away. Again, there were millions of German-American citizens in the United States whose interests had to be safeguarded by the Government of the land of their adoption. And also there was a possibility of the United States being given the honour of "mediator" when the time was ripe for peace. All these things, together with the fact that America had always been a peace-loving country and thus was unprepared to take part in a great and exhaustive warfare, weighed in the balances and managed to keep the bar horizontal.

Three or four great insults to American power, in so far as she stood for humanity in warfare, followed in fairly quick succession. The sinking of the British ship *Falaba* was nothing short of murder. The passengers and the crew, numbering nearly one hundred, were given five minutes to get away. And in the midst of the confusion a German sub-

marine commander with terrible bloodthirstiness launched a torpedo, and while the drowning ones were struggling for life the crew of the submarine "laughed and jeered." Leon C. Thrasher, an American citizen, went down with the crew. This infra-human atrocity appealed to the hearts of all true Americans and at once branded the German naval warfare as "piracy."

Very soon after this an American ship, the *Gulflight,* flying the American flag, was sent to the bottom by the pirates, which tragedy opened the whole question of Germany's attitude towards the United States in a very direct and striking manner. Once more an American ship, namely, the *Cushing,* was torpedoed, and to bring the whole thing to a fitting climax the giant *Lusitania* was sent to the bottom with about 1,500 lives, of whom over a hundred were Americans.

Then came President Wilson's note to Germany under date of May 13th carrying with it the hearty approval of the people of the Republic. It claimed the right of American citizens engaged in peaceful missions to sail on merchant ships of any nationality and yet be immune from attacks on the high seas. It demanded a disavowal of certain acts of piracy, reparation for injuries done to Amer-

ican citizens, and strongly advised that there should be no recurrence of those acts "so obviously subversive of the principles of warfare." It was made very clear to Germany that no submarine had any right to destroy vessels carrying contraband of war without examination and proper provision for the safety of crew and passengers.

This note sent in the name of the American people was an admirable production of the American mind made after sober and earnest deliberation. Major Curley splendidly characterized it as containing strength, mercy and dignity and proceeding from a mind that combined the determination of a Washington with the logic of a Lincoln.

The author of "The Peace and America" makes no comment upon this latest expression of the American attitude. The idea is gradually penetrating even the German mind that Germany has gone a little too far. She has wounded the goose that laid the golden egg and the next thing to do is to heal the wound somehow so as not to hinder the production of future golden eggs of sympathy. The "whole finance ministers" and diplomats of Germany have set to work to accomplish this very task. No more does our author blame America for "disregarding her historic mission as

peacemaker." There is no use in crying "peace, peace!" when there is no peace and the enemy is at the door. No longer does he point to the "warping" or "twisting" of the "news sources" as the cause for the revulsion of American feeling in respect to Germany. He places his hand before his mouth and whispers: "Unclean!" No more does he charge Britain with employing every subterfuge to embitter America against Germany. He even ceases his prattle concerning the German desire for peace, for he knows that the murdering of over one hundred men, women and children on the high seas is by no means calculated to arouse feelings of sympathy in the minds of the American people.

With the American note of protest in the *Lusitania* case in their hands and with the German note in answer being prepared the Leyland freight liner *Armenian* was sent to the bottom and eleven American lives were lost. If Germany can show that this happened without sanction from the Imperial Government there is yet hope that no new complications will arise. But the United States authorities are strongly suspicious that the Germans are following the old game of killing time and simply trifling with them while the submarine warfare upon innocent

people proceeds. It is evident that notwithstanding the diplomatic communications to Germany of February 10th, May 13th and June 9th, the rules of civilized warfare and the protests from Washington are treated as something less than "scraps of paper."

When all this proceeds with the sanction of the Fatherland, can the German-American expect anything else than to see "social ties cut," and to feel his heart pierced with "ill will"? After all "ill will" is not half so bad as a torpedo nor the cold shoulder anything to be compared to the cold waters of the Atlantic! Germans in America "may forgive but never forget the cruel wrong which was done to them."* What a farce this is! Wrong indeed! How can a people speak of wrong when they have no conception of its opposite namely, right? How can a professor of a great university look into the faces of the people of a free land, relations of the one hundred sent down in the *Lusitania* destroyed by a German torpedo, and accuse them of persecution? What indeed have Americans to forgive? The slight straining of social ties that Germans have to suffer is but a drop in the bucket compared with the death-punishment

*"The Peace and America," page 20. Münsterberg.

meted out to American citizens who dare to trust themselves to the freedom of the high seas.

Imagine, if you can, an American professor in the University of Berlin writing a book setting forth in strong language the idea that England was right in this warfare and Germany wrong and wicked and arrogant! How long would he be allowed to carry on his propaganda? German authorities would soon land him in prison and German public opinion would turn so strongly against him that he would be compelled to quit the country. Americans are, thus, paying the price for their principle of freedom, and the long-suffering people tolerate, so long as they hold to their principles, persons who know not the meaning of gratitude.

To show how intolerant the Germans are in respect to any words that involve German condemnation even when uttered in a free land, we have the example of the letter of Dr. Kuno Meyer of the University of Berlin, written to President Lowell of Harvard University, concerning a prize poem by a student printed in the *Harvard Advocate.* Charles Huntington Jacobs, a Harvard Junior, was the writer of the poem, entitled "Gott Mit Uns." The poem is as follows:—

GOTT MIT UNS.

No doubt ye are the people: wisdom's flame
Springs from your cannon—yea, from yours alone.
God needs your dripping lance to prop His Throne,
Your gleeful torch His glory to proclaim.
No doubt ye are the people; far from shame
Your Captains who deface the sculptured stone
Which by the labour and the blood and bone
Of pious millions calls upon His name.

No doubt ye are the folk: and 'tis to prove
Your wardenship of Virtue and of Lore
Ye sacrifice the truth in reeking gore
Upon your altar to the Prince of Love,
Yet still cry we who still in darkness plod:
"'Tis Antichrist ye serve and not your God."

As soon as this poem was seen by Dr. Kuno Meyer of the University of Berlin he wrote a scathing arraignment of Harvard University, President Lowell, Dean Briggs and Professor Bliss Perry embodied in an epistle to the president of the university. The poem itself was branded by Dr. Meyer as "slanderous, vile and damnable," and he expressed also a hope that no German would ever be found to accept the post of exchange professorship at Harvard. Certainly this attitude might have been partly due to the fact that his lectureship had been cancelled by the corporation December 18th, because Dr. Meyer had debased himself by trying to influence the Irish people against England and in favour of Germany. How

little he succeeded in this is evident from the fact that according to John E. Redmond's report 120,741 Irishmen from Ireland had joined the army against the common foe up to June 16th.

This letter of Dr. Meyer was well characterized by President Ira N. Hollis of the Worcester Polytechnic Institute as "foolish in the extreme" and calculated to fill "all sensible Germans with regret." But it is a splendid example of German intolerance and indicates a total lack of knowledge of American institutions. The reply of President Lowell was a fitting expression of the feeling towards the whole matter of the leading members of a great institution.

And now what shall we say concerning peace? There is need of warning here, and the great generous-hearted people who are constantly seeking peace ought to understand the possible results better than they do. There is no surer way of encouraging the enemy than by demanding peace. The demand for peace must come from the enemy, must proceed from the nation that first dared to break up modern civilization. It is a splendid thing to feel like Carlyle and express yourself thus: "O my brother, my brother, why cannot I shelter thee in my bosom, and wipe away all tears from your eyes?" But when your so-called brother

is a treacherous enemy ready to stab you for your pains you are tempted to beware.

Also, the initiator of peace is at a disadvantage. When M. Thiers tried to discuss peace with Bismarck the "latter steadily refused to make known the conditions which he would affix to the peace. While he kept his cards tightly closed in his two hands, M. Thiers arrived with his wide open before him." The Allies must never place themselves in such a position before Germany.

Germany must be sent back to her own land. The great assassin of Europe must be disarmed and by force compelled to keep the peace. A brave and determined enemy must be conquered but it cannot be conquered in a day. It will take years to do so. But everyone who has a right understanding of the war and its causes believes that it must be done.

Alsace and Lorraine must be relinquished and Belgium must be returned with a large indemnity to the Belgians. Schleswig, too, that belonged to Denmark, must be given back. Germany, the great "robber-state," will be sternly called upon to disgorge. Austria will probably lose Bosnia, Herzegovina, Dalmatia and Croatia, and Italy will get the Trentino and Italia Irredenta. Then there will be a great restriction of armaments and America will have her say in reference to this.

But who can predict at this date what part America will finally play in the great world-struggle? The next six months may witness her dreadnoughts ploughing the ocean and making for the enemy's strongholds.

Most Americans to-day regard Germany as the great outlaw of the planet, and with an outlaw of such strength loose in the world they realize that there is little hope of peace. Germany must be disarmed or America herself is doomed, with the other nations, to a constant increase of armaments. Then she would have to reach for her last dollar to perfect the fighting machine. With German militarism powerful it would be impossible to limit armaments.

A peace with such a vile enemy as Germany has shown herself to be, while she continues to hold any part of Belgium and France, would be a disgrace to the civilized world. A peace that would give Germany ample scope to begin preparations for another world-tragedy would be nothing but a disaster. A peace that would allow the Hohenzollerns and the Hapsburgs to congratulate themselves upon their bloody achievements, would be greatly regretted by every other nation of the world. Nothing can save Germany herself and the rest of Europe from the iron rule of the military spirit but a complete defeat for the great Teutonic power.

CHAPTER VIII.

TO-MORROW.

Professor Münsterberg looks to the future with some misgivings. He sees a "dark fog hanging over the valley of peace into which the next turn of the road must lead us."* He remembers with joy the words of Prince Henry at Harvard University on the event of the presentation of treasures from the German Emperor to the Germanic Museum. They are as follows: "May true friendship, based on genuine understanding and good will, never cease between the United States and Germany!" That was a whole-hearted wish made in the presence of a famous group of Americans and also before the gentle-minded Admiral von Tirpitz, the controlling mind of the German navy, who was present to add more weight to the occasion. This imposing drama was transacted March 6th, 1902, and it was calculated to swell with pride the breast of every German present and to inspire the "blustering Yankees" with thankfulness that they were privileged to see such a gathering.

*"The Peace and America," page 227. Münsterberg.

That was one scene. A little over thirteen years afterward there was a great stir at Queenstown as scores of coffins, many of which were covered with the Stars and Stripes, were being unloaded from small steamers and sailing vessels. Everyone spoke under his breath and tears were in the eyes of many! What had happened? The giant Cunard liner *Lusitania,* without a moment's warning, had been torpedoed and sunk by a German submarine at the command of the same Admiral von Tirpitz who sat as a member of the distinguished company at Harvard University and heard the brother of the German Emperor say: "May true friendship never cease between us!" So much for the supreme manifestation of German friendship. And "those who knew the laws" of the German mind, as I suppose the author of "The Peace and America" knew them, could have worked out the "psychological necessity" of even this dastardly act.

A war "serving materialistic purposes only is a sordid business, degrading the fighter in victory no less than in defeat."* But is not this war materialistic and mechanical at its very heart? Is it not the outcome of an absolutely mechanical soul that has been preparing for war for many, many years and to this end

*"The Peace and America," page 232. Münsterberg.

piling up munitions in such vast quantities as to astonish the world? Is not the whole world more or less under the tyranny of physical things? And has not one nation so far outstripped all others in mechanism and materialism that a great fighting machine has been created that finally turned upon its builders and compelled them to give it a chance to express itself or to carry out the activities for which it was called into existence?

Yes, a great fighting machine has been constructed, perhaps first planned and initiated under the driving power of fear. But once it was constructed it became unmanageable and finally demanded that it should be given the rein. Germany is now paying the price of her cult of mechanism. There is good psychology here. It means that external activity persistently carried on will at last produce a state of mind that corresponds to the activity. Thus James illustrating this law remarks: "Whistling will so react on the inner life as to keep the courage up." However weak the spirit of militarism was at first in the innermost recesses of the German soul the constant treadmill preparation for a great struggle, reaching out into every part of national life, was as certain at last to produce a corresponding warlike mind as the sun's rays constantly beating upon a rock are certain to produce

heat in it. This is the very thing that has happened, and really the very thing dreaded by Professor Münsterberg has come to pass.

The war is a materialistic one and rose from the abysses of a mechanical soul. Its great purpose is the expansion of material power. The latter statement is supported by numerous facts. For instance, the German soldiers on the Western Front carried with them in their knapsacks a little book called "Tornister Wörterbuch English," that is, an English dictionary for the knapsack, showing that Germany had been actively preparing for a particular war since 1912. Again, the maps of the British Isles, and especially of London, that appear in it indicate that there existed for several years an expeditionary force especially designed to land on the British Isles.

Many sentences and words in the dictionary have special reference to London and other towns in England. For instance, we come across the sentence, "*London liegt an der Thames,*" and also its equivalent in English, namely, "London lies on the Thames," together with other sentences and words useful only to an army invading England. German equivalents for such words as "requisition," "booty," "plunder" are in evidence, and above all the word so dear to the Prussian heart, "*Zerstörung,*" meaning "destruction."

Touches of German politeness in an enemy's land are not wanting in the "Wörterbuch." Here are sentences translated into English that a German would find it impossible to dispense with: "Show me to my room. That dirty hole? What do you think?" "What? have you no other room in this big house? Open the doors! I am going to choose a room myself. Here I shall stay. Take these things out of the room!" "Speak the truth! A lie will cost your life!" "Waiter, make haste! We don't like to wait a quarter of an hour for every glass of beer."

Imagine rude German soldiers, brainless and domineering, entering peaceful homes and demanding, at the point of the bayonet, the best room in the house in which to sleep and the best food that could be procured to eat. And then after they have their fill imagine them still further demanding to see one's pocket-book. But all this is nothing compared with what would happen if once our fair land became a battlefield for Teutonic soldiers.* The horrors of Belgium would be repeated without scruple in Montreal, Toronto, Quebec, St. John, Halifax and in many other places.

---

*See "German Atrocities," by William Le Queux. "The Kaiser and His Barbarians," by W. N. Willis.

This may appear purely imaginary to the unsophisticated, but within two years it will probably be attempted. Germany's eye has been upon the vast acres of the Dominion for many years. What use would the British Isles be as a land for the reception of Germany's surplus population? No more people could be stowed into London or Manchester or Liverpool. No, the German purpose reaches beyond the little Island to the north of France and includes the vast stretches of Canada, and finally the whole of the American continent. To carry out this programme certain preliminaries are necessary, namely, the conquering of Kitchener's army, the silencing of the Russians, and the crippling of the British fleet. The Russians have already been driven back so far as to be compelled to abandon Warsaw to the armies of Field Marshal von Hindenburg and Von Mackensen. Soon a million from the Austro-German army will be liberated to reinforce the armies in the West. Then a struggle will begin of which we dare not predict the end.

The world has had a hint of the tenacity of the German soldier when once he reaches a vantage-ground. Belgium is a good example. With a German army upon Canadian soil all hope of future freedom for Canada would vanish. And this is a future possibility.

If exhaustive plans for the invasion of England and France were made years ago, there is every reason to believe that plans for the successful invasion of Canada are already in the safes at the German Foreign Office. Germany certainly designs to invade Canada. Already in the Teutonic imagination the "magnificent blonde brutes" of Nietzsche are landing at Quebec, Halifax and St. John, having been successfully transported over the broad Atlantic. If this dream does not materialize it is not the fault of the Teutons but of the Allies. And let me say just here that this dream will become a reality if Canada does not awaken from her slumbers and use every national utility for the successful consummation of the war.

Instead of 100,000 men Canada must give and equip a half million soldiers. Instead of 1,000 machine guns made in the United States, Canada must produce from factories of her own 5,000, or even 10,000. And it can be done. It only needs that we become serious and organize for the war. Instead of $150,000,000 we must raise $500,000,000. Our brave political leaders, Sir Robert Borden and Sir Wilfrid Laurier, with their officers, are doing their best to organize the nation for the conflict, but they need the whole-hearted response of the people of the Dominion, and certainly

they must not refuse it in this hour of need whatever sacrifice it involves. England's ancient honour must be protected. Canada's noble traditions must be upheld. There are thousands of others even now in Canadian factories, mills and shops as brave as those who flung themselves in the way of the advancing Teutonic hordes at Ypres. There are hundreds of others on Canadian soil as noble and as resolute as those who won back the Canadian guns at Langemarck. Let them now respond to the call before the war-cloud throws its deep shadows over the fair Canadian plains and our land is turned into a wilderness.

The words of a famous Roman seem to come to us with renewed power just here: "I conjure you, therefore, to maintain a brave and resolute spirit; and to remember, when you advance to battle, that on your right hands depend riches, honour and glory, with the enjoyment of your liberty and of your country. If we conquer, all will be safe. But if we lose the victory through want of courage, those same places will turn against us; for neither place nor friend will protect him whom his arms have not protected. Besides, soldiers, the same exigency does not press upon our adversaries as presses upon us; we fight for our country, for our liberty, for our

life; they contend for what but little concerns them, the power of a small party. Attack them, therefore, with so much the greater confidence, and call to mind your achievements of old."*

This war is certainly a materialistic war, notwithstanding Münsterberg's thought that the German, at least, is not guilty of materialism. On May 29th, according to a stenographic report of the proceedings of the Reichstag, a Conservative deputy, Count Westarp, in his speech regretted that the Social Democrats had said that "this war may not end with territorial conquests." Herr Schiffer made reference to the goal to be attained. Dr. Karl Liebknecht shouted: "What goal?" Herr Schiffer remarked that "real safeguards" must be created, and "if these real safeguards demand an extension of our borders, if the military necessities require that these borders be extended in order to be better equipped for our defence with less bloodshed in the future, then we consider it a moral duty to insist upon that." Dr. Liebknecht shouted: "Capitalist interests!" for which correct remark he was subjected to indignant interjections.

In this speech of Herr Schiffer the German design was clearly referred to but "necessity"

*"Catiline—to His Army Near Pistoria." Reported by Sallust. Translated by John S. Watson.

was invoked as an excuse for seizing territory. Again, a well-known German publisher wrote that Germany was in possession of practically the whole of Belgium and a big section of France, together with a "considerable portion" of Poland, with the suggestion that by no means would she relinquish her hold upon them.

Still more recent animated debates in the Reichstag indicate that there is a strong party in Germany opposed to her Imperialism. The Imperialists constantly emphasize the thought that Germany should work for a lasting peace. And this sounds well enough without interpretation. The Social Democrats pierce the surface-film of German diplomatic language and see clearly the Prussian intentions. This is why the Democrats are constantly blocking, as well as their power will permit, the German programme of conquest.

The Germans want "permanent peace," the Reichstag asseverates, but from their standpoint they contend that this "permanent peace" can be secured only by the permanent occupation of Belgium and the acquisition of a part of France and a "considerable portion of Poland." These, of course, are the minimum conditions and are now given forth by a disappointed Germany as if they were the maximum. We know that the maximum in-

cludes world-dominion by one power, namely, that of Germany. We have evidence enough of this. Professor Usher of Washington University says on this point in his book, "The Germans aim at nothing less than the domination of Europe and of the world by the Germanic race."* Thus, not only must soil "soaked with German blood" be theirs, but countries whose soil German soldiers never trod and that have nothing in common with Teutonic ideals must be dominated, as a "safeguard" to permanent peace. The peace demanded is a peace with Germany on top and ruling the world. It is a peace in which the non-warlike majority will cringe at the sight of the mailed fist. There might never have been a war if all the world had looked on and allowed Germany to crush Serbia. The conflict with Russia might have been averted if the stealing of Bosnia and Herzegovina and the humiliation of Serbia had been calmly endured by the Bear on Germany's eastern border. Yes, Germany wants peace, but the conditions would be such that if they were honestly made known the whole world would gape with astonishment.

"Least of all, could anything be gained for lasting peace by crushing and humbling any

*"Pan-Germanism." Professor Usher.

of the belligerent nations?"* The special but veiled reference here is to Germany. Don't humiliate the German for he will not stand for it, is the dictum that goes forth from Berlin, and our author is here, in a broad way, emphasizing the admonition for the benefit of the Allies in general and of the United States in particular. But what are we to do with them? Preaching will not send them home. If a foe more barbarous and depraved than any that has appeared since the Stone Age has occupied for over a year the countries of the Allies and has devastated the land, reducing much of it to a desert, and has hung his "*Verboten*" everywhere, is there not good reason for humiliation when the opportunity arrives?

When a nation expresses its "most beautiful German virtues" by poisoning wells, using poisonous gases and liquid fire, screening its soldiers from the fire of the enemy by old women and children, sinking passenger ships without warning and breaking all the laws of civilized warfare, it deserves to be humiliated so that it cannot look into the face of honest nations for centuries to come.

The noble professor of psychology leaves us no alternative but submission to the German aims clearly marked out by Treitschke and

*"The Peace and America," pages 234, 235. Münsterberg.

Bernhardi. The imperialism of the House of Hohenzollern must be a world-imperialism. If you ask why, the professor will tell you it is founded on bare worth. The ideals of Germany are worthy to prevail. England has had her turn at almost world-empire and she did not deserve it. Germany now should take the rein, for she deserves it. "The timorous, craven nation trusting to her fleet"* should no longer rule, for she is not a nation of soldiers, but of shop-keepers. Only a "nation of warriors" should have the title-deed to the world.

But do German ideals *deserve* to prevail? And is it right to force them upon unwilling nations? What has been the result when those ideals have prevailed? Verhaeren, the great Belgian, will answer: "While France, at the end of half a century, makes herself beloved in Savoy, at Mentone, and at Nice, while in the space of two centuries she assimilates Lille and Dunkirk and Strasburg and Alsace; while England in a few decades unites to her Egypt and the Cape; Germany remains detested in Poland, Schleswig and in Alsace-Lorraine. Germany is essentially the *persona ingrata* everywhere it presents itself." The "beautiful German virtues"† extracted by the

*"Germany and England," page 30. Cramb.

†"The Peace and America," page 241. Münsterberg.

pressure of force and authority degenerate into mere mechanical activities and have no moral value whatever. And yet they are set forth as the means of redemption for the whole world. Is the world prepared to give the Hohenzollern ideals and virtues a chance?

Prepared or not prepared, Germany is putting forth every effort to cause her ideals to prevail. These efforts have already drenched Europe in the blood of millions and still the professor shouts: "Make way and let the Teuton prevail!" We have sent our bravest and best to the trenches in the West, we have given of our money and our energies to preserve freedom and justice, and still the enemy plunders and the cry goes forth: "Don't humiliate Germany!" This cry is accompanied by the following veiled threat: "But a Germany stirred by indignation over the brutal force of seven combined powers which selfishly encircled and destroyed the young idealistic nation, such a Germany would have no right to yield to the joys of peace; it could not rest until the hour of justice came. The happy Germans would rush to the farms and the factories; the indignant Germans would stay in the trenches. Whoever says, Let us humble Germany, says, Let us make peace impossible."* The admonition is: don't attempt

*"The Peace and America," page 241. Münsterberg.

to humiliate Germany, for she will certainly turn back upon you at last and strike a death blow.

The following out of this admonition would turn back entirely the course of moral activity. Should not an individual in some way be punished for his sins? As a man soweth so shall he reap. That is the moral law. It is not different with nations. The nation that takes the sword will perish with it. The blood of the innocent in both Belgium and America calls for vengeance from the ground. We do not expect to punish Germany by miracle, but God has chosen England and her Allies to lay the proud usurper low. It will take vast sacrifices in the future, as it has demanded immense sacrifices in the past. But every man with the cause of justice and freedom at heart will say that the sacrifice must be made even to the uttermost farthing and the last drop of blood. Chesterton is right when he remarks that the only hope for the world is a stake through the heart of militant Prussia.

The noble author of "The Peace and America" has sympathies that reach to the ends of the earth. Not only does he wish well for Germany, but also for England, for he "has always felt an instinctive admiration for England" notwithstanding her "pitiless aggression" and her "war against Germany." His

latest concern is for the future of America. She has been contaminated by England, who has "succeeded in supplying her with news and opinions as it supplied China with opium."* America has been drugged very seriously by the opium of British news. Besides this, England has interfered with the trade of the United States and so rules the seas that the latter has to give heed always to her beck and nod! Thus, he warns the United States to look out for her own future. "If England is able to crush Germany," he says, "its naval power will have such absolute command of the sea that it must interfere with the natural development of America's oversea trade, and the conflict would become unavoidable." How deep and broad the sympathies of this man are? But what is all this bluster about? He wishes to show the United States that her great enemy is England and not Germany. If he can convince the United States of this he knows that he will be doing great service for the Fatherland.

But what would happen if Germany did win? Not only would there be a violation in thought of the Monroe Doctrine, but the United States would be actually invaded, for that would be only a part of the Prussian

*"The Peace and America," page 203. Münsterberg.

programme. There is no pessimism in this. Almost every one of the seven hundred books on the war published in Germany last year points towards the same universal goal. Germany may feel that "any colonizing efforts in the American continent would mean a war."* But is not war her chief business? Any nation such as Germany that delights in war, when flushed with victory over the Allies, would not hesitate a moment to invade America, especially if the latter had not carried out Prussian ideas in respect to neutrality. When one of the "Young Germany" leaders could write, in 1913, words like the following, what can we say in respect to a nation's permanent peaceful intentions:

"War is the noblest and holiest expression of human activity. For us, too, the glad great hour of battle will strike. Still and deep in the German heart must live the joy of battle and the longing for it. Let us ridicule to the utmost the old women in breeches who fear war and deplore it as cruel and revolting. No, war is beautiful, its august sublimity elevates the human heart beyond the earthly and the common. In the cloud palace above sit the heroes, Frederick the Great and Blücher, and all the men of action—the Great Emperor,

*"The Peace and America," page 255. Münsterberg.

Moltke, Roon and Bismarck—are there as well, but not the old women who would take away our joy in war. When here on earth a battle is won by German arms and the faithful dead ascend to heaven, a Potsdam lance-corporal will call the guard to the door, and old 'Fritzy,' springing from his golden throne, will give the command to present arms. That is the heaven of young Germany."

The fact is it would by no means pay the United States for Germany to win, since it would mean the overthrow of her own most precious ideals. Thus we are told that "hundreds of factories have quickly been turned into producers of ammunition and armament. No plant in Pittsburg is working full time to-day but those which have been turned into feeders of war."* And the author fears that the wheels will not stop even when peace is declared. These munitions are, he complains, used against Germany. Yes, and why should they not be if Germany is shattering to pieces American ideals? America is taking part in the war in a very effectual way, by supplying the material by which the Allies carry it on. And it is not "partiality or commercialism," but it is partiality *and* commercialism. It is because the English and American peoples

*"The Peace and America," page 257. Münsterberg.

have the same moral ideals and the same national purposes that America is at heart partial to the Allies. And again, if in the doing of her duty she can increase her commercial power it is perfectly legitimate for her to do so. Her activities in this regard are by no means "un-American," and only the blustering and dogmatic German would dare to pronounce them such.

Liberty has always been the great distinguishing ideal of America. It has moulded all her institutions and influenced all her statesmen. It has been the great driving force in all her legislation and in the construction of her type of government, and Patrick Henry voiced the sentiments of millions of Americans when he shouted in the old church in Richmond: "Is life so dear, or peace so sweet, as to be purchased at the price of chains and slavery? Forbid it, Almighty God! I know not what course others may take; but as for me, give me liberty or give me death!"

But the whole German policy is designed to smother and throttle liberty. It began when Bismarck was at the height of his power and is still regnant. Bismarck, the "human vampire," won for the Crown a "physical and moral victory," the influence of which is cursing the whole world to-day. "From that time the confidence of the German people in Par-

liamentary government was broken."* "Liberalism," says Prince Buelow, "has to this day not recovered from the catastrophic defeat."† The German of to-day goes to pieces without his master, his decorations and his rules. He is a wooden man that never moves until his superior touches the button. His liberty is a thing of the past. The world changes around him, but he never changes for he lives in a flattened moral world of two dimensions, the other, of which he is entirely ignorant, being liberty. The Hohenzollern knows no mutation. The Weismannian‡ race-germ of the Prussian is as stable as can be, and will always remain so, it matters not what happens in the rest of the world. When the Emperor asseverated: "There is but one law, and that is my will," he meant it in the depths of his heart, and he would say the same to-day if occasion arose, for once a Hohenzollern always a Hohenzollern. Stein's maxim, "Authority not majority," expresses the deepest purpose of the Prussian soul. Every national good flows from the fountain-head, namely, the Crown. Great is the Kaiser among the rulers.

---

*"Life of Bismarck." Headlam.

†"Imperial Germany," page 120. Buelow.

‡"Studien zur Descendenztheorie." Leipzig, 1875-1876.

"The great questions are to be settled," said Bismarck, "by blood and iron," and in no other way. "One only is master within the Empire and I will tolerate no other. Those who are willing to help me in my endeavors are cordially welcome. Those who oppose me I will smash," says Kaiser William. Speaking of his world-policy as compared with Bismarck's circumscribed plans, he remarks: "My course is the right one and I will follow it." "Nothing must henceforth be settled in the world without the intervention of Germany and the German Emperor." These words ring true to the heart of the Prussian to-day.*

But such a tendency of thought the world outside of Germany cannot tolerate. It clearly indicates that although the world in general has made great strides in moral and spiritual attainment, one part of it remains stationary. Here the soldiers simply mark time. France, England and Italy have outstripped the land of the Tenton in the forward march of nations along the road of Christian morality, while the latter has said, with the Chinaman, "That which was good enough for my fathers is good enough for me."

For three centuries Germany was content

*See "Britain's Case Against Germany," page 88. Ramsay Muir.

with bare wealth of thought and intellect. She did not think enough of political affairs even to seek unity for her scattered States. Her children were children of romance and dreams. She loved to revel in the music of Mozart, Bach, Wagner and Beethoven, who were indigenous to her soil. France was welcome to be ruler of the physical world, and Britannia might rule the wave, but what did Germany care so long as she was first in the realm of romance and thought? But Germany is no more as she has been. From a nation of ideas, she suddenly became a land of industry and next a great military power. Intoxicated with success in her own hand, she suddenly began to dream of world Empire. To accomplish this a great military machine was necessary. Certainly freedom had to be sacrificed, but what of that, so long as Germany found her place in the sun? Once the ideal was envisaged it became so fascinating that it won her whole soul.

Thus she began, and every part of her life, industrial, educational, and political, was organized for world-dominion. A stupendous military machine, made wholly in Germany, was produced and designed to call forth the energies of the world. An entire nation in the heart of Europe was placed under arms. This, indeed, was the beginning of Germany's

ruin. The Chancellor of Leland Stanford University has well said, "No nation in which every man is a soldier can keep its senses." We might add: A nation cannot follow the policy of Universal Conscription and yet nurture free and responsible men. The hand that imposes Universal Conscription takes man, as it were, from the field of morality, and puts him on the level with the brute. Every moralist understands that without freedom there is no meritorious action, and hence no virtue. He also knows that compulsory military service is the greatest stroke that can be aimed at personal liberty. And militarism itself is the death of liberty.

One more glance will show us clearly how far the imperial spirit has carried Germany. Let us summon for a moment and by way of testimony, our old friend Heinrich von Treitschke. Expressing the very core of the Prussian purpose he thus speaks: "When the German flag covers and protects this immense Empire to whom shall the sceptre of the universe belong? What nation shall impose her will upon the others in a state of weakness and decadence? Shall it not be Germany, whose mission it will be to guarantee the peace of the world? Russia, a vast, half-developed colossus, with feet of clay, will be absorbed in economic and internal difficulties; England,

stronger in appearance than in reality, will doubtless see her colonies break away and become exhausted in fruitless struggle; France, a prey to discord and faction, will sink deeper and deeper into decadence; as for Italy, she will be able to do no more than assure a meagre existence to her sons. The future belongs to Germany, and Austria, if she values her national existence, will stand by her side."

We are content to let Germany carry out her plans at home, but when she claims the world as her parish, our entire personality rises up to assert itself. Shall we allow German imperialism to dominate our fair land? Must Canadian liberty and individual rights be handed over to the cruel and warlike Teuton? Must we substitute machine-planned, machine-created and machine-led activities for our highly-prized liberty? Must we bow the knee to the plunderers of Belgian treasures and the murderers of women and children? No, a thousand times, no! Better die upon the bullet-swept plains of Flanders or in marshes of Poland. Better die of crucifixion with many of the beloved priests, servants of God, who suffered at Aerschot, Malines, Liège and Namur, in Belgium. Better suffer in a German dungeon under a process of slow starvation or die the terrible death caused by

asphyxiating gases. Better endure almost anything else than be subject to the murderers of our sons and fathers, insulters of our women and the butchers of our children.

The question now arises as to how we are going to avert the catastrophe of German domination. England must bestir herself, and Canada must be made to feel the weight of the war more than she does now. The war will probably last three or four years longer, or until the belligerents are fully exhausted. Let us make no mistake. A nation with such proud aims and imperialistic notions as the Prussians possess cannot be conquered in a year or in two years. A nation bred in militarism, with every adult a soldier, will need vast efforts to be overcome. A nation that has taken fifty years to perfect a military machine of such proportions as to astonish the world, cannot be bought off by a few concessions. There is only one answer for the taunts of the giant Teuton, and that must be a fiery response from the mouth of a cannon. Since it has proved impossible to reach his heart by words of love, and it is imperative that we reach it somehow, there is nothing left for us but the bayonet or the bullet.

Certainly, we do not wish that the bayonet should be our final weapon. It is only used by civilized nations in extreme cases. But

fire must be fought by fire. When the heart grows hard enough to shed blood or to oppress humanity the whip of small cords must be used. So it is with the British attitude towards Germany. For the present we must fight, but militarism opposed to militarism will not finally prevent or cure war. When war is here it is all right to oppose it by force of arms and to increase the production of munitions to the very limit, for the successful prosecution of the struggle. But once this war is over there must be no more such preparations for warfare, for wherever there are vast preparations for conquest there will finally be a struggle proportionate to the preparations made.

The heart of Germany must be changed, and we will not stop there, but say that the heart of England also must undergo conversion. Wherever there is mechanism at heart it will, under favorable conditions, show itself in the external world. Europe could not spend ten million dollars every day in preparation as it did before the war and yet prevent a disastrous and bloody struggle. The diplomats who knew more about politics than psychology called it protection against war, but by the very laws of the human mind the tremendous preparations so kept the idea before the minds

of the nations that at the first opportunity war broke out.

The industrialism of Europe is only one degree less baneful than its militarism! They both indicate that the Western world is unsound at heart. Mechanical materialism is eating at the vitals of both Europe and of America.

This is very evident from many sources. The rich man is usually rich because he has at his command vast machinery. Human beings spend their short lives running this machinery and the thoughts of their hearts are suppressed to such a degree that they themselves become at last a part of the machinery. In respect to this, Alfred Russel Wallace tells us that in England the "vast textile factory system may be said to have commenced with the nineteenth century, and the profits were at first so large and so dependent on the supply of labour that the mill-owners hired children from the workhouses of the great cities by hundreds and even thousands. These children, from the age of five or six upwards, were taken as apprentices for seven years, and they really became the slaves of the manufacturers. Children and women were found to be working underground in coal mines, under equally vile conditions as regards health and

morality."* "Money-making is placed above human life and human well-being." These facts indicate that materialism shows itself in various ways, and militarism is scarcely a worse channel for its expression than industrialism.

But how are we to change the heart of Europe in general and of Germany in particular? Our programme is clear as to the first step. German militarism must be overcome at any cost. To submit to this would be to turn back final conversion a thousand years. Cecil Chesterton is right when he intimates that it is a religion that we are fighting. It is a religion that makes a god of power and brute force that menaces the world. This god has shown himself in various parts of the world, but especially in Germany. There his altar has been built. There sacrifices were made to him every day. Every morning millions of Germans in shining helmets have prayed to *him:* "O Baal, hear us!"*

Thoroughly convinced under the teachings of Nietzsche, Treitschke, Bernhardi and others that he is the God, the Prussian applies himself to the new evangel. He must preach his

*"Social Environment and Moral Progress," page 51. A. R. Wallace.

*"The Prussian Hath Said in His Heart." C. Chesterton.

gospel. He must make a way for the new Scriptures, and with this in view he sallies forth with his Bible in one hand and the sword in the other. He knows full well that the triumph of Germany will also be a triumph of German religion, and this he desires above all else. The new religion is not of Judea or of Galilee, but one that places "Mohammed above Christ," and Valhalla above the New Jerusalem. Germany, stunted by the Christian religion in the fifth century, threw it off as a worn-out garment in the seventeenth. The nineteenth century witnessed the phenomenon of the German triumphant struggle against Christianity itself. Thus, one of the boldest exclaims: "And ye have heard men say, Blessed are the peacemakers, but I say unto you, Blessed are the war-makers, for they shall be called, if not the children of Jahve, the children of Odin, who is greater than Jahve."

To destroy this new God and new religion, Prussia must be crushed. She is not worthy to live and her religion is not worthy to prevail. Europe outside of Germany has had her faults, but, as Chesterton remarks, "none save Prussia has ever said 'Evil, be thou my good.'" The first step, then, is to effectually suppress this new evil. This must be attempted. The twentieth century is witnessing a crusade far

greater, and with far more reason, than any of those that went forth periodically for over two centuries to set up Christian rule in Palestine and to preserve respect for the name of the Christ. The religion of Christ is once more attacked and millions of soldiers with shining helmets bearing the standard of Odin, are pressing the siege. Oh, for men like Godfrey de Bouillon or Bohemund of Otranto, who fought their way to Antioch and Jerusalem at the end of the eleventh century, to march forward to-day upon this new crusade, for the battle rages around the cross more fiercely than ever.

After militarism is crushed the next step is to turn our attention to the death of mechanical industrialism. But unless we can restore the religion of the Galilean our struggle with the latter evil will be in vain. If the Galilean conquer in the first instance He will also conquer in the last. But He will not do it miraculously. The work of human betterment is left for human hands.

Industrialism in England has made a fearful gap between the privileged classes and the masses, and this war has struck at its very heart. To conquer militarism and leave industrialism to rejuvenate would be to gain but little. The second arm of the great giant Materialism must be cut off if the world is to

regain her freedom. But this task does not come seriously before us until after the war.

We must, then, bend all our energies to the first task. We must conquer the Prussian. There are only two ways open to us, namely, to lose our individuality and freedom, yes and our national religion as well, or crush the Teuton. To this latter work let us apply ourselves. Let us not allow fear to rule in our mortal spirits.

"'Wherefore, like a coward, dost thou forever pip and whimper and go cowering and trembling? Despicable biped! What is the sum-total of the worst that lies before thee? Death? Well, Death; and say the pangs of Tophet, too, and all that the Devil and Man may, will, or can do against thee! Hast thou not a heart, canst thou not suffer whatsoever it be; and, as a child of Freedom, though outcast, trample Tophet itself under thy feet, while it consumes thee? Let it come, then; I will meet it and defy it!' And I shook base fear away from me forever."* It is for all true lovers of liberty to follow in the footsteps of Carlyle with respect to fear in these days that call so loudly for bravery.

---

*"Sartor Resartus," page 184. Carlyle.

DATE DUE

APR 12 1992			
APR -2 1992			
JAN 28 1994			
JAN 20 1994			
NOV 26 2004			
NOV 26 2004			
DEC 13 2006			
DEC 06 2006			

CARR McLEAN, TORONTO FORM #38-297

D 515 .S66 1915
Squires, Charles William,
Munsterberg and militarism che
010101 000
0 1163 0011898 5
TRENT UNIVERSITY

D515 .S66 1915
Squires, Charles William, 1877-1948
Munsterberg and militarism checked

198075

DATE | ISSUED TO

198075